Fathers of the Catholic Church

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF
Mrs. Alice O Kelley
Class 984e
W 131
31

SIGNS OF THE TIMES
EDITORIAL LIBRARY.
No. .....
NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE OFFICE.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/fathersofcatholi00waggrich

FATHERS

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THE

"FALLING AWAY" OF THE CHURCH

IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

"To the law and to the testimony;
If they speak not according to this word, it is because there
is no light in them" Isa. 8 : 20.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.
OAKLAND, CAL.,
SAN FRANCISCO AND NEW YORK.
1888.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1883, by

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,

In the office of the Librarain of Congress, Washington, D. C.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
OAKLAND, CAL.,
PRINTERS, ELECTROTYPERS, AND BINDERS.

PREFACE.

THIS book is the outgrowth of some extracts which I copied into a pocket scrap-book a few years ago, thinking that it would often be convenient to have at hand the exact words of a few reliable historians, concerning the Fathers and their work, when the histories themselves might not be accessible. It soon occurred to me that something similar would be of value to others, especially since the Fathers are being appealed to more and more, and it is impossible for the majority, even of ministers, always to have access to their writings. Accordingly, extracts were made on a more extensive scale, and were woven together, the result being this book, which is in reality a brief account of the rise of that antichristian structure called the papacy, which was built on the foundation of the so-called Fathers, the heathen philosopher Plato being the chief corner-stone.

If any apology is needed for removing the veil of sanctity which has been thrown over the early church as a whole, I will make it in the words of Rev. Ralph Emerson, D. D., some time Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary: "The fact that deadly falsehoods were circulated in the church by some men, and believed by multitudes, is itself a most important historic truth; and to suppress such a truth, instead of being a merit, is a fault which should rather crimson the cheek and set on fire the conscience of a modest and honest historian. It is itself but a tacit repetition of the crime of pious frauds which so deeply stained, not only heathen morality, but the early though not the primitive character of the church."

Again, in the same article, which is on the "Early History of Monasticism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, May, 1844, after speaking of the policy of covering up such things, he says:—

"This short-sighted and worldly policy, of late years so

158290

prevalent among the incautious Protestant churches, is in truth the very policy of Romanism. The Romanists plead that the full and fearless disclosures of the crimes and follies of good men, in the Bible, will be perilous to the virtue of the people, and will disparage religion itself in popular estimation. And so they conceal the good book. And thus Protestants fear that the uninspired disclosures of later crimes and follies in the church, may have a like effect. Such men as the excellent Milner, one age ago, knew not for what a crisis they were preparing the church by suppressing or gilding over the more revolting features of her early history. Satan himself could not have prompted such men to do him so great a service in any other way. He is not only the father of lies, but the greatest suppressor of a knowledge of those lies, when they come to be detected as lies; and for this purpose, he comes to good men, in the guise of an angel of light, and as the greatest friend to the church, and makes them his ready and devoted tools in a cause seemingly so charitable towards man and loyal towards God. And then, if we suppose him to possess the power, what better thing for his cause could the enemy of the church do, than just bid her advocates to look at her early state as well-nigh immaculate, and fearlessly to follow in her perilous steps?"

This work is designed especially for people who have not the time nor the means to become thoroughly informed in matters of church history; and also for itinerant ministers and Bible workers, who, even though they be well read, cannot carry a theological library with them from which to quote in time of need. It is hoped, also, that the book may serve as an incentive to some to make a systematic study of church history, and may aid them in so doing. And it is not impossible that the grouping of subjects may suggest new ideas, even to those who have read the entire history of the early church. Indeed, the book is mainly suggestive, the most exhaustive portion being the chapter on "Sun-worship and Sunday." History repeats itself; and only he who knows the course of error in the past can be on his guard against its insidious approaches in the future.

Great care has been taken in verifying the historical references, so that the disputant who uses this book might feel as confident as though he had the origina. works. Nevertheless, infallibility is not an attribute of either author or proof-readers, and if anyone detects an error in any reference, I shall esteem it a favor to be informed of it. In the appendix will be found brief biographical sketches of some of the men from whose writings extracts have been made. It is thought that this addition will be of value to some who will use the book.

I would not forget to acknowledge the service rendered by my friends, Elders E. W. Farnsworth, W. C. White, and A. T. Jones, who read the book in manuscript, and made valuable suggestions.

And now the book is sent forth with the prayers of the writer that it may be instrumental in causing many to see the folly of man's wisdom, and leading them to prize more highly than ever before the unerring word of God, which alone is able to make them wise unto salvation.

E. J. W.

Oakland, Cal., August 5, 1888.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE HEATHEN WORLD. - - - - - - - - 9–27

CHAPTER II.

HEATHEN PHILOSOPHY. - - - - - - - - 28–44

CHAPTER III.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. - - - - - - - - 45–56

CHAPTER IV.

THE FATHERS. - - - - - - - - - 57–73

CHAPTER V.

THE "EPISTLE OF BARNABAS." - - - - - - 74–83

CHAPTER VI.

HERMAS AND CLEMENT. - - - - - - - - 84–96

CHAPTER VII.

THE "EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS." - - - - - - 97–112

CHAPTER VIII.

THE "TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES." - - - - 113–124

CHAPTER IX.

IRENÆUS. - - - - - - - - - - - - 125–145

CHAPTER .

JUSTIN MARTYR. - - - - - - - - - 146–164

CHAPTER XI.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. - - - - - - - 165–183

CHAPTER XII.

TERTULLIAN. - - - - - - - - - - 184–216

CHAPTER XIII.

ORIGEN. - - - - - - - - - - - 217–241

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GREAT APOSTASY.—Heathen and Catholic Mysteries—Perversion of the Ordinance of Baptism —Sign of the Cross, and Images. - - - 242–268

CHAPTER XV.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (Continued).—Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead—"Pious" Frauds—Immorality in the Church. - - - - - - - 269–285

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (Continued).—Relic and Martyr Worship—Sunday and Christmas. - - 286–303

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (Continued).—Sun-Worship and Sunday. - - - - - - - - 304–328

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (Concluded).—Growth of Papal Assumption. - - - - - - - 329–345

APPENDIX.

The True and Abiding Sabbath—The Apostles and the First Day of the Week—Biographical Notes. 347–363

CHAPTER I.

THE HEATHEN WORLD.

In order clearly to comprehend the peculiar dangers of the early Christians, we must know the condition of the heathen world in the time of Christ and his apostles, since it was mainly from among the heathen that converts to Christianity were obtained. If we know the beliefs which men held, and the practices to which they were addicted before their conversion, we can readily tell what errors they would be most likely to adopt if they should in any degree turn from the faith; and we shall also know what would be the state of the church if any considerable number of its communicants were converted only in name.

In the first chapter of Romans the apostle Paul has given a brief but comprehensive view of the state of morals among the heathen, and of the steps by which they reached the depth of degradation which is there revealed. He first notices the fact that at one time the people did know God. Verse 21. From the Mosaic record we learn the same thing. We know that in the years immediately following the creation and the flood, all the inhabitants of the earth had the knowledge of the true God. Adam and Noah—the two fathers of the race—served the Lord, and they would of course teach their children about him and his requirements. There could, therefore, be no excuse for the gross ignorance which afterward prevailed.

Even had this oral teaching been wanting, there would have been no excuse for the abominable idolatry and the ignorance of God, which characterized nearly all of the inhabitants of the earth, because nature itself reveals not only the existence, but also the power of God. In speaking of the heathen, Paul indicates the justice of God in pouring out his wrath upon them, "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in [to] them; for God hath showed it unto them." Rom. 1:19. The next verse tells how God revealed himself unto them. As we quote it, we transpose the clauses, to save the necessity of explanation by comment: "For from [*i. e.* since] the creation of the world, the invisible things of him [God], even his eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; so that they [those who deny God] are without excuse." More than this, the same apostle tells us that God "left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." Acts 14:17. The psalmist also tells us that "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Ps. 19:1. So plainly does nature teach the existence of God, that he who even in his secret thought says, "There is no God," is justly called a fool. Ps. 14:1. Such an one may be said to be ignorant of the a b c of knowledge.

Nevertheless it is a fact that the nations did forget God; and Rom. 1:22–32 is an accurate description of their condition in consequence. The truthfulness of this description is attested by the heathen themselves. They deified the most profligate men and women, and worshiped vice instead of virtue. Their gods were male and female,

and mythology, *i. e.*, the history of the gods, is little else than a record of licentiousness. The Baal and Ashtoreth of the Canaanites, were the Jupiter and Venus of the Romans and Greeks, and every heathen nation had gods corresponding to them. The temples erected to them were magnificent brothels, and their priestesses were prostitutes. Licentiousness was not simply *allowed*, but it was *commanded* as an act of religion. Among the Babylonians it is said that, "once at least in her life, every woman was obliged to prostitute herself in the tempel of Bel."—*American Cyclopedia, art. Babylon.* Heathenism "had made lust into a religion, and the worship of its gods a school of vice, penetrating all classes of society."

As it is not our object in this discussion to give simply our views, but to give the reasons for the views which we hold, we shall invariably quote from authorities, so that the reader may examine for himself. Let the reader first read Rom. 1:18–32, and then compare it with the quotations that follow. Professor Stuart, in his "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," says on the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter:—

"The evidences of the fact here stated by the apostle are too numerous and prominent among the heathen writers to need even a reference to them. Virgil himself, 'the chaste Virgil,' as he has been often called, has a *Corydon amabat Alexin* [Corydon loving Alexis], without seeming to feel the necessity of a blush for it. Such a fact sets the whole matter in the open day. That at Athens and Rome παιδεραστία [sodomy] was a very common and habitual thing, needs no proof to one who has read the Greek and Latin classics, especially the amatory poets, to any considerable extent. Plutarch tells us that Solon practiced it; and Diogenes Laertius

says the same of the stoic Zeno. Need we be surprised, then, if the same horrible vice was frequent in the more barbarous parts of Greece and the Roman Empire?"

In the heathen worship there were "mysteries," to which only the initiated were admitted. These were celebrated in the inner temples, and it is doubtless of them that the apostle Paul speaks when he says: "For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." Eph. 5:12. If the things recorded in the first chapter of Romans were done openly, what must have been the depth of the wickedness that was done in secret, and of which it is a shame even to speak? But let it be understood that the heathen themselves felt no shame for any of their practices. They gloried in them, as things which brought them nearer to the gods. The more licentious they were, the more nearly they resembled the gods which they worshiped. The worst abominations were done in secret, not out of a sense of shame, but to show that certain ones had advanced beyond the common people in matters of "religion." On this point, Professor Stuart, in commenting on Rom. 1:24, says:—

"The imputation is, that in apostatizing from the true God, and betaking themselves to the worship of idols, they had at the same time been the devoted slaves of lust; which indeed seems here also, by implication, to be assigned as the reason or ground of their apostasy. Everyone knows, moreover, that among almost all the various forms of heathenism, impurity has been either a direct or indirect service in its pretended religious duties. Witness the shocking law among the Babylonians, that every woman should prostitute herself, at least once, before the shrine of their Venus. It is needless to say, that the worshipers of Venus in Greece and Rome practiced such

rites; or that the mysteries of heathenism, of which Paul says 'it is a shame even to speak,' allowed a still greater latitude of indulgence. Nor is it necessary to describe the obscene and bloody rites practiced in Hindostan, in the South Sea and the Sandwich Islands, and generally among the heathen. Polytheism and idolatry have nearly always been a religion of obscenity and blood."

Summing up the evidence against them, Paul says that they were "filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." Rom. 1:29–31. And to crown all, he adds that they not only did these things, but had pleasure in those who did them. Nothing could exceed such depravity. As Professor Stuart says:—

"It is often the case, that wicked men, whose consciences have been enlightened, speak reproachfully of others who practice such vices as they themselves indulge in. Few profligate parents, for example, are willing that their children should sustain the same character with themselves. But when we find, as in some cases we may do, such parents encouraging and applauding their children in acts of wickedness,* we justly consider it as evidence of the very highest kind of depravity."

"It is of such depravity as this that the apostle accuses the heathen. And justly; for even their philosophers and the best educated among them, stood chargeable with such an accusation. For example; both the Epi-

* Witness the well-known case of the Spartans, who made it a business to teach their children to steal and lie, and among whom the highest virtue known was skill in committing and concealing what are ordinarily termed crimes.

cureans and the Stoics allowed and defended παιδεραστία [sodomy] and incest, numbering these horrid crimes among the ἀδιάφορα, *things indifferent.*"—*Comment on Rom. 1: 32.*

This was the state of morals, not alone of the lower, uneducated classes, but of the philosophers,—those who instructed the youth in "virtue." That the apostle uses the term, "without understanding," with respect to the morals, and not the intellect, will be readily seen from the following quotations:—

"From the ignorance and uncertainty, which (we have seen) prevailed among some of the greatest teachers of antiquity, concerning those fundamental truths which are the greatest barriers of virtue and religion, it is evident that the heathens had no perfect scheme of moral rules for piety and good manners. . . . They accounted revenge to be not only lawful, but commendable. Pride and the love of popular applause (the subduing of which is the first principle of true virtue) were esteemed the best and greatest incentives to virtue and noble actions; suicide was regarded as the strongest mark of heroism, and the perpetrators of it, instead of being branded with infamy, were commended and celebrated as men of noble minds. But the interior acts of the soul,—the adultery of the eye and the murder of the heart,—were little regarded. On the contrary, the philosophers countenanced, both by arguments and example, the most flagitious practices. Thus theft, as is well known, was permitted in Egypt and in Sparta; Plato taught the expediency and lawfulness of exposing children in particular cases; and Aristotle, also, of abortion. The exposure of infants, and the putting to death of children who were weak or imperfect in form, was allowed at Sparta by Lycurgus; at Athens, the great seat and nursery of philosophers, the women were treated and disposed of as slaves, and it was enacted that 'infants, which appeared to be maimed, should either be killed or exposed;' and

that 'the Athenians might lawfully invade and enslave any people, who, in their opinion, were fit to be made slaves.' The infamous traffic in human blood was permitted to its utmost extent; and, on certain occasions, the owners of slaves had full permission to kill them. . . . Customary swearing was commended, if not by the precepts, yet by the example of the best moralists among the heathen philosophers, particularly Socrates, Plato, Seneca, and the Emperor Julian. . . . The gratification of the sensual appetites, and of the most unnatural lusts, was openly taught and allowed. Aristippus maintained that it was lawful for a wise man to steal, commit adultery, and sacrilege, when opportunity offered; for that none of these actions were naturally evil, setting aside the vulgar opinion, which was introduced by silly and illiterate people; and that a wise man might publicly gratify his libidinous propensities."

"Truth was but of small account among many, even of the best heathens; for they taught that on many occasions, a lie was to be preferred to the truth itself! To which we may add, that the unlimited gratification of their sensual appetites, and the commission of unnatural crimes, was common even among the most distinguished teachers of philosophy, and was practiced even by Socrates himself. . . . 'The most notorious vices,' says Quinctilian, speaking of the philosophers of his time, 'are screened under that name; and they do not labor to maintain the character of philosophers by virtue and study, but conceal the most vicious lives under an austere look and singularity of dress.'"—*Horne's Introduction, vol. 1, chap. 1.*

In confirmation of the statement that the philosophers encouraged lying, Dr. Whitby collected many maxims of the most eminent heathen sages, from which Dr. Horne quotes the following:—

"A lie is better than a hurtful truth."—*Menander.*

"Good is better than truth."—*Proclus.*

"When telling a lie will be profitable, let it be told."—*Darius, in Herodotus, lib. iii, c. 62.*

"He may lie, who knows how to do it, in a suitable time."—*Plato.*

"There is nothing decorous in truth, but when it is profitable; yea, sometimes truth is hurtful, and lying is profitable to men."—*Maximus Tyrius.*

Mosheim says of the time just preceding the introduction of Christianity:—

"The lives of men of every class, from the highest to the lowest, were consumed in the practice of the most abominable and flagitious vices; even crimes, the horrible turpitude of which was such that it would be defiling the ear of decency but to name them, were openly perpetrated with the greatest impunity."—*Historical Commentaries, vol. 1, chap. 1, sec. 21, of Introduction.*

Notwithstanding the unpleasant nature of the theme, we shall pursue it a little further, for it is absolutely necessary that we understand that vice and immorality everywhere prevailed. Speaking of the domestic life of the heathen, Dr. Philip Schaff, in his "History of the Christian Church" (vol. 1, sec. 91), says:—

"Monogamy was the rule both in Greece and in Rome, but did not exclude illegitimate connections. Concubinage, in its proper legal sense, was a sort of secondary marriage with a woman of servile or plebeian extraction, standing below the dignity of a matron and above the infamy of a prostitute. It was sanctioned and regulated by law; it prevailed both in the East and the West from the age of Augustus to the tenth century, and was preferred to regular marriage by Vespasian, and the two Antonines, the best Roman emperors. Adultery was severely punished, at times even with sudden destruction of the offender; but simply as an interference with the rights and property of a free *man*. The wife had no legal or social protection against the infidelity of her

husband. The Romans worshiped a peculiar goddess of domestic life; but her name, *Viriplaca*, the appeaser of husbands, indicates her partiality. Besides, it must be remembered that the intercourse of a husband with the slaves of his household and with public prostitutes was excluded from the odium and punishment of adultery. . . . The women, however, seem to have been as corrupt as their husbands, at least in the imperial age. Juvenal calls a chaste wife a '*rara avis in terris*' [a rare bird in the earth]. Under Augustus, free-born daughters could no longer be found for the service of Vesta, and even the severest laws of Domitian could not prevent the six priestesses of the pure goddess from breaking their vow. Divorce is said to have been almost unknown in the ancient days of the Roman republic. But the customary civil and religious rites of marriage were gradually disused; apparent open community of life between persons of similar rank was taken as sufficient evidence of their nuptials; and marriage, after Augustus, fell to the level of any partnership, which might be dissolved by the abdication of one of the associates."

If the thoughtful reader has his mind almost involuntarily directed, by these statements, to the loose conditions of society in our own time, it will not be a matter of surprise. The last days, said our Saviour, will be as the days before the flood, when men "took them wives of all which they chose" (Gen. 6:2); and when we consider the ease with which divorce may be obtained, the pleasure that is taken in reading the details of scandal, as indicated by the prominence given them by the press, and the readiness with which *men* of known licentiousness are received in "good society," we see strong evidence that the end is near at hand.

We have stated that the more licentious the people were, the more nearly they resembled the gods whom

they worshiped. A few quotations concerning the religion of heathenism will give us a still deeper insight into the morals of the people. Says Schaff:—

"How could there be any proper conception and abhorrence of the sin of licentiousness and adultery, if the very gods, a Jupiter, a Mars, and a Venus, were believed to be guilty of those crimes? Modesty forbids the mention of a still more odious vice, which even depraved nature abhors, which yet was freely discussed and praised by ancient poets and philosophers, practiced with neither punishment nor dishonor, and likewise divinely sanctioned by the lewdness of Jupiter with Ganymede."—*History of the Church, vol. 1, sec. 91.*

Another writer says:—

"As to the *religion* of heathenism, it is 'a wild growth on the soil of fallen human nature, a darkening of the original consciousness of God, a deification of the rational and irrational creature, and a corresponding corruption of the moral sense, giving the sanction of religion to natural and unnatural vices. . . . The gods are involved by their marriages in perpetual jealousies and quarrels. Though called holy and just, they are full of envy and wrath, hatred and lust, and provoke each other to lying and cruelty, perjury and adultery.'"—*McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, art. Heathen.*

Such being the nature of the gods, it cannot be expected that the religion of the heathen could possess any high moral tone. Says Gibbon:—

"The devotion of the pagans was not incompatible with the most licentious skepticism. Instead of an indivisible and regular system, which occupies the whole extent of the believing mind, the mythology of the Greeks was composed of a thousand loose and flexible parts, and the servant of the gods was at liberty to define the degree and measure of his religious faith."—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 23, paragraph 3.*

The same author, in the twelfth paragraph of the chapter mentioned above, in speaking of the attempts of the Emperor Julian to restore the ancient worship of the gods, characterizes it as "a religion, which was destitute of theological principles, of moral precepts, and of ecclesiastical discipline."

In harmony with the quotation last made, Professor Worman says:—

"Polytheism was always a religion of mere ceremony, unassociated, as a religion, with any moral law. Hence the most religious man in the sense of polytheism might be a shameless profligate, emulating the gods to whom he sacrificed, in their reputed licentiousness, and guilty (as was Socrates) of crimes against which even nature revolts."—*McClintock and Strong, art. Paganism.*

Dr. Mosheim, in the introduction to his "Historical Commentaries," gives us a view of the peculiar religion of each of the various nations, and in summing up says:—

"None of these various systems of religion appear to have contributed in the least towards an amendment of the moral principle, a reformation of manners, or to the exciting a love, or even a respect, for virtue of any sort. The gods and goddesses, who were held up as objects of adoration to the common people, instead of exhibiting in themselves examples of a refined and supereminent virtue, displayed in illustrious actions, stood forth to public view the avowed authors of the most flagrant and enormous crimes. The priests likewise took no sort of interest whatever in the regulation of the public morals, neither directing the people by their precepts, nor inviting them by exhortation and example, to the pursuit of a wise and honorable course of life; but on the contrary indulged themselves in the most unwarrantable licentiousness, maintaining that the whole of religion was comprised in the rites and ceremonies instituted by their ancestors, and

that every sort of sensual gratification was liberally allowed by the gods to those who regularly ministered to them in this way."—*Chap. 1, sec. 20.*

Although each nation had its own peculiar gods, the gods of all other nations were respected, and their worship was tolerated. Says Gibbon (chap. 2, paragraph 2):—

"The various modes of worship, which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people, as equally true; by the philosopher, as equally false; and by the magistrate, as equally useful."

If it be objected to this statement that the Jews and Christians were often persecuted with relentless severity, and their religion proscribed, a sufficient answer will be found in the fact that the worshipers of the true God abhorred the heathen worship, and would not countenance it in any manner. Not content with worshiping God in secret, they (especially the Christians) taught the people that "they be no gods, which are made with hands." Indeed the simple worship of Jehovah was a standing rebuke to the licentious worship of the idolaters. But idolatry was the State religion, and all who opposed it were considered as plotting against the government. In persecuting the Christians, the emperors did not consider that they were warring against a religion, but against treasonable fanaticism. Nothing but idolatry was called religion, and the Jews and Christians were persecuted as instigators of treason.

On this point Neander says:—

"All the ancient religions were national and State religions, and this was especially the case with the Romans, among whom the political point of view predominated in everything, not excepting religion. The public apostasy of citizens from the State religion, and

the introduction of a foreign religion, or a new one not legalized by the State (*religio illicita*), appeared as an act of high treason. In this light was regarded the conversion of Roman citizens or subjects to Christianity. 'Your religion is illegal' (*non licet esse vos*), was the reproach commonly cast on Christians, without referring to the contents of their religion."—*Memorials of Christian Life, chap. 3, paragraph 2.*

The fact, also, that the worship of Jehovah would, if tolerated, tend to check the free indulgence of their passions, acted as an additional spur to the zeal of the heathen persecutors.

The following quotation has quite an important bearing on our future investigation. In speaking of the sacrifices and other rites of the heathen, Mosheim says:—

"Of the prayers of pagan worshipers, whether we regard the matter or the mode of expression, it is impossible to speak favorably; they were not only destitute in general of everything allied to the spirit of genuine piety, but were sometimes framed expressly for the purpose of obtaining the countenance of Heaven to the most abominable and flagitious undertakings. In fact, the greater part of their religious observances were of an absurd and ridiculous nature, and in many instances strongly tinctured with the most disgraceful barbarism and obscenity. Their festivals and other solemn days were polluted by a licentious indulgence in every species of libidinous excess; and on these occasions they were not prohibited even from making the sacred mansions of their gods the scenes of vile and beastly gratification."—*Historical Commentaries, Introduction, chap. 1, sec. 11.*

When even the religion which men profess tends to deepen their natural depravity, what good can be expected of them? No man can fully comprehend such wickedness; for the man who has had no experience in

such debasing forms of sin cannot understand how anybody can sink so low; and the man who has descended to the depths of vice has his moral sense so blunted that sin no longer appears sinful. We might quote pages upon pages of matter similar to the above, but we do not wish to harrow the reader's mind with any more than is actually necessary to impress upon it the condition of the world into which the apostles were sent out as sheep among wolves. As showing the degeneracy of the ancient heathen, and also how sin can obliterate from the heart all true conception of right and wrong, the following is to the point:—

"One of the most formidable obstacles which Christian missionaries have encountered in teaching the doctrines and precepts of the gospel to the heathen, has been the absence from their languages of a spiritual and ethical nomenclature. It is in vain that the religious teachers of a people present to them a doctrinal or ethical system inculcating virtues and addressed to faculties, whose very existence their language, and consequently the conscious self-knowledge of the people, do not recognize. The Greeks and Romans, for example, had a clear conception of a moral ideal, but the Christian idea of *sin* was utterly unknown to the pagan mind. Vice they regarded as simply a relaxed energy of the will, by which it yielded to the allurements of sensual pleasure; and *virtue*, literally manliness, was the determined spirit, the courage and vigor with which it resisted such temptations. But the idea of *holiness* and the antithetic idea of *sin* were such utter strangers to the pagan mind that it would have been impossible to express them in either of the classical tongues of antiquity."—*William Matthews, LL. D., in "Words; Their Use and Abuse," pp. 70, 71.*

In leaving this part of the subject, we present a summary in the shape of some extracts from Dr. Edersheim's

great work, "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah." In it he has admirably portrayed the condition of the Roman world in the time of Christ. Speaking of the city of Rome, the mistress of the world, he says:—

"Of a population of about two millions, well-nigh one-half were slaves; and, of the rest, the greater part either freedmen and their descendants, or foreigners. Each class contributed its share to the common decay. Slavery was not even what we know it, but a seething mass of cruelty and oppression on the one side, and of cunning and corruption on the other. More than any other cause, it contributed to the ruin of Roman society. The freedmen, who had very often acquired their liberty by the most disreputable courses, and had prospered in them, combined in shameless manner the vices of the free with the vileness of the slave. The foreigners—specially Greeks and Syrians—who crowded the city, poisoned the springs of its life by the corruption which they brought. The free citizens were idle, dissipated, sunken; their chief thoughts of the theater and the arena; and they were mostly supported at the public cost. While, even in the time of Augustus, more than two hundred thousand persons were thus maintained by the State, what of the old Roman stock remained was rapidly decaying, partly from corruption, but chiefly from the increasing cessation of marriage, and the nameless abominations of what remained of family life."—*Vol. 1, book 2, chap. 2.*

Again in the same chapter he says:—

"Without tracing the various phases of ancient thought, it may be generally said that, in Rome at least, the issue lay between Stoicism and Epicureanism. The one flattered its pride, the other gratified its sensuality; the one was in accordance with the original national character, the other with its later decay and corruption.

Both ultimately led to atheism and despair—the one, by turning all higher aspirations selfward, the other, by quenching them in the enjoyment of the moment; the one, by making the extinction of all feeling and self-deification, the other, the indulgence of every passion and the worship of matter, its ideal."

Lastly, from the same chapter from which the above is taken, we quote the following:—

"Rome tolerated, and, indeed, incorporated, all national rites. But among the populace, religion had degenerated into abject superstition. In the East, much of it consisted of the vilest rites; while, among the philosophers, all religions were considered equally false or equally true—the outcome of ignorance, or else the unconscious modifications of some one fundamental thought. The only religion on which the State insisted was the deification and worship of the emperor. These apotheoses attained almost incredible development. Soon not only the emperors, but their wives, paramours, children, and the creatures of their vilest lusts, were deified; nay, any private person might attain that distinction, if the survivors possessed sufficient means. Mingled with all this was an increasing amount of superstition—by which term some understood the worship of foreign gods, the most part the existence of fear in religion. The ancient Roman religion had long given place to foreign rites, the more mysterious and unintelligible the more enticing. It was thus that Judaism made its converts in Rome; its chief recommendation with many being its contrast to the old, and the unknown possibilities which its seemingly incredible doctrines opened. Among the most repulsive symptoms of the general religious decay may be reckoned prayers for the death of a rich relative, or even for the satisfaction of unnatural lusts, along with horrible blasphemies

when such prayers remained unanswered. We may here contrast the spirit of the Old and New Testaments with such sentiments as this, on the tomb of a child: 'To the unjust gods who robbed me of life;' or on that of a girl of twenty: 'I lift up my hands against the god who took me away, innocent as I am.'

"It would be unsavory to describe how far the worship of indecency was carried; how public morals were corrupted by the mimic representations of everything that was vile, and even by the pandering of a corrupt art. The personation of gods, oracles, divination, dreams, astrology, magic, necromancy, and theurgy,* all contributed to the general decay. It has been rightly said, that the idea of conscience, as we understand it, was unknown to heathenism. Absolute right did not exist. Might was right. The social relations exhibited, if possible, even deeper corruption. The sanctity of marriage had ceased. Female dissipation and the general dissoluteness led at last to an almost entire cessation of marriage. Abortion, and the exposure and murder of newly-born children, were common and tolerated; unnatural vices, which even the greatest philosophers practiced, if not advocated, attained proportions which defy description."

The picture is not a pleasant one, yet it but faintly represents the moral condition of the world when Christ commissioned the apostles to preach the gospel. We say the "moral condition *of the world*," because the whole

*In a foot-note Dr. Edersheim says:—

"A work has been preserved in which formal instructions are given, how temples and altars are to be constructed in order to produce false miracles, and by what means impostures of this kind may be successfully practiced. (Comp. "The Pneumatics of Hero," translated by B. Woodcroft.) The worst was, that this kind of imposture on the ignorant populace was openly approved by the educated. (Döllinger, p. 647.)"

This will serve to explain many Roman Catholic miracles. The pagan temples that in the time of Constantine fell into the hands of Christians, were used as churches, and the old places of worship must have been, to the new converts, very suggestive of old forms of worship.

world was at that time essentially heathen. A comparatively small number of Jews formed the only exception, and the greater part of them had been corrupted by the speculations of heathen philosophers. The twenty-third chapter of Matthew shows that the Jews, as a class, were but little, if any, better than the Gentiles whom they despised.

It was from this state of degradation that the gospel essayed to lift men; from people addicted to such practices, the early Christian churches were formed. When we consider this, instead of wondering at the heresies that crept into the church, and the disorderly conduct that was sometimes tolerated even in the apostolic churches (see 1 Cor. 5:1, 2), we are amazed at the heights of piety to which many attained. The fact that even among that corrupt mass thousands were found who would give, not only their property, but themselves also for the advancement of the cause of truth and holiness, is a wonderful monument to the regenerating power of Christianity.

But great changes are not made instantaneously. Even though men are converted, they need instruction, since they are then but babes in the truth; and this fact shows that old habits of thought and practice cannot at once be entirely forgotten. We do not mean to intimate that the converted man has any license to sin, or any excuse for it; but pardon for sins is not sanctification; the one who has been pardoned is not perfect, but is to "go on to perfection;" and he still needs an advocate with the Father, that his imperfections may still be pardoned and overcome. Now men are always tempted on the side of their natural inclinations; if the converted

man gives way to temptation, it will be his old sins that he will commit; and when, as is too often the case, a man joins the church without having been thoroughly converted, of course the old habits will continue unchanged.

Let the student of church history remember this, and at the same time bear in mind what has been quoted concerning the moral condition of the people among whom the gospel gained its victories, and it will throw light on many phases of professed Christianity. It will also prevent him from attaching too much importance to the precepts and practices of even the foremost of those in the Christian church who had been brought up in heathenism. He will always compare every act or saying of those men with the Bible, to see to what extent their early training was allowed to bias their course.

CHAPTER II.

HEATHEN PHILOSOPHY.

In the preceding chapter we have briefly considered the wickedness of the ancient heathen world; in this we shall investigate the primary cause of that degradation. In this investigation, the Bible must still be our guide. After Paul had stated that all might know God from his works, he thus set forth the cause of the blindness of the heathen: "When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things." Rom. 1: 21–23.

"They became fools." That is, they lost that knowledge of God, which they had possessed; for it is the fool who says, "There is no God." The gods of the heathen were of their own making, and had no influence over them, to keep them from evil, and so, while the heathen believed in the gods, and had forms of worship, they acted as though there were no God. Now it is not necessarily with his lips that the fool denies the existence of God; he may deny God in his heart, and actions are the language of the heart. So, in the sight of Heaven, the heathen, in spite of their philosophy, were fools. We may here remind the reader that these words of the apostle are not necessarily confined in their application

to people resident in heathen lands. The inhabitants of so-called Christian countries, if when they know of God, do not glorify him as God, but, professing themselves to be wise, glorify only themselves, are, in the Bible sense, heathen. And if they persist in their course, there is nothing to prevent them from sinking to the same depths of vice that the ancient heathen did.

We said above that the heathen, in spite of the wisdom of their philosophers, were counted as fools. We should say that their professed wisdom was the direct cause of their foolish degradation. Paul says, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." In order to demonstrate this, it will be necessary to take a brief glance at ancient heathen philosophy. In so doing we shall take as a sample of the world, not the poorest, but that which is universally acknowledged to be the most elevated in its tone. Thus we shall avoid the imputation of injustice.

Plato was the most illustrious philosopher of ancient times. He is regarded as, in a sense, the father of philosophy, for he was the first philosopher who founded a school. He was born about B. C. 427, and died about B. C. 347, at the age of eighty. In his twentieth year he formed the acquaintance of Socrates, whose disciple he became. Plato continued with Socrates, until the death of the latter, when he found it necessary to leave Athens, lest he should share the fate of his master. For a time he was the guest of Euclid, at Megara, whose doctrines he imbibed to some extent. After several years' wandering in various countries, he returned to Athens, where he opened a school of philosophy. His school was held in the grove of the hero Academus, for which

reason he called it the "Academy;" and subsequently his system of philosophy became known as the "Academic Philosophy." (Encyc. Brit., art. Academy.) After his death he was worshiped as a god, and many of the Athenians sacrificed to him. See Seneca's sixth letter, quoted in McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, article "Plato."

Although Plato is said to have developed and systematized the philosophy of Socrates and of others who had preceded him, it is well known that he himself had no real "system." That is, he had no fixed principles of truth by which he tested, and around which he gathered, new ideas. Says Prof. G. F. Holmes (McClintock and Strong's Encyc., art. Plato): "There is little in Plato of a dogmatic character," and "much of tentative, skeptical, and undefined exploration." Again we read, in the same article:—

"Very few of the treatises of Plato are constructive or dogmatical. Nearly all of them are simply negative or inquisitorial. The latter do not seek to maintain any dependence on the former. . . . His object was not the establishment of a doctrine, but the stimulation of candid investigation, in order to free his hearers from the stagnation of thought and the obsession of vulgar or treacherous errors. He was not a *doctrinaire*, but an inquirer; or, rather, he taught the need and practice of investigation; not a body of conclusions."

The testimony which we quote is from a source, prejudiced, if in either direction, in favor of Plato, so our readers may be sure that we are doing him no injustice. Now let us notice the above paragraph. First, Plato's treatises are nearly all negative. Second, there is no attempt at uniformity. Third, as would naturally be supposed, he

did not seek to establish any doctrine, but only to stimulate inquiry. Now we would not appear to deprecate the "stimulation of candid investigation;" but when the "investigator" has no fixed principles of truth, as the basis of his investigation, and his investigation leads to no definite conclusions; when one thought is not in harmony with that which preceded it, and is itself contradicted by that which follows,—we cannot look upon it with much respect. We cannot see that such investigation is good for anything; indeed, we think it can be shown that it is worse than nothing. When a person is so "unprejudiced" that he regards everything as equally good, and is not certain that anything is good, he certainly is not a safe man to follow. The position of modern "agnostics" is precisely the same as that of Plato. Indeed, he deserves the name of the "first great agnostic," rather than that of "philosopher." While calling himself a philosopher, "lover of wisdom," he did not profess to *know* anything, and he held no idea with sufficient firmness to be willing to be held responsible for its promulgation. Says the author above quoted:—

"He never appears *in propria persona* [in his own person]. There is nothing to connect him before the Athenian dicasteries with any tenet in his writings. *There is a constant avoidance of definite doctrine,* a frequent censure of written instruction, a continual reference to the 'obstetrical procedure,' and a deliberate renunciation of all responsibility."

This was the man who had the chief influence in moulding the minds of the heathen for several hundred years. How could it be expected that they would have any fixed moral principles? If the blind lead the blind, shall they not both fall into the ditch? What shall we say

then, when we learn that, by multitudes of professed Christians, Plato has been regarded as little less than inspired? and that many of the Fathers of the first centuries regarded the Platonic philosophy as preliminary and even paramount to Christianity? Must we not conclude that such "Christianity" would have radical defects? We shall find that such was the case. We might, even here, cite as proof of the demoralizing effect of the writings of Plato and other philosophers, the condition of the church in the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, when philosophy took the place of the Bible in the theological schools. It was against this soul-withering "philosophy" that Luther struck some of his hardest blows; and, but for the influence it had gained in the church, the Reformation would not have been necessary. It is because of Plato's great influence on the Christian church, as well as on the heathen world, that we devote space to the characteristics of his philosophy. Again we quote:—

"The subjects which he handled were not only deep, but unfathomed by him; not only dark, but undefined. Their imperfect apprehension by himself was reflected by the indistinctness of his utterances. There was also a misguiding star by which he was often led astray, and tempted into pathless intricacies. *The imagination of Plato was the commanding faculty of his intellect,* and he followed its beams too far."

"The philosophy of Plato is essentially mystical, and consequently unsubstantial; and, though mysticism may inflame, spiritualize, and refine natures already spiritual and refined, it is heady and intoxicating, and apt to justify willful aberrations, and to place every fantastic conviction on the same level with confirmed truth."—*McClintock and Strong.*

That Plato's mysticism had this effect, we shall see as

we proceed. It is impossible that mysticism should have any positive influence for good; but even allowing that it can "spiritualize and refine natures already spiritual and refined" (an unnecessary task), it can accomplish nothing, since in this world such natures do not exist. What more is needed to show that Plato could not be a safe guide in anything, than the statement that the controlling part of his intellect was his imagination? Surely this cannot afford a basis solid enough to elevate one to Christ. But mystical as Plato was, we shall see in due time that he was equaled, and even surpassed, by some of his followers, who are honored by the appellation of "Fathers of the Christian Church."

According to Plato, all things were not directly framed and regulated by the Supreme Divinity. For the government of "the sensible universe" (that is, the portion appreciable by the senses), he created a subordinate deity, and placed it over the natural creation. This guiding spirit, or *demiurge*, was a mixture of the ideal and the natural. The world, he taught, was not made from nothing, that is, not created, but formed from eternally existing matter.

But the fatal defect in his philosophy was the position he took concerning the mind, and its relation to the body and to the whole universe. He held that the mind or soul holds the same relation to the body that God does to the world. The pre-existence of souls was a cardinal point in his philosophy, and it is to him that the Mormons are indebted for the theory which is the foundation of their polygamy. Like the Mormons, he held that not only men, but plants and all inaminate objects also, have souls, which existed prior to themselves. Thus, Prof. W. S. Tyler, of Amherst College, says:—

"There is no doctrine on which Plato more frequently or more strenuously insists than this,—that soul is not only superior to body, but prior to it in order of time, and that not merely as it exists in the being of God, but in every order of existence. The soul of the world existed first, and then it was clothed with a material body. The souls which animate the sun, moon, and stars, existed before the bodies which they inhabit. The pre-existence of human souls is one of the arguments on which he relies to prove their immortality."—*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, art. Platonism.*

And that was the only means by which he could prove the immortality of the soul. If the soul is by nature immortal, the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls must be true. Like modern scientists, however, who invent a hypothesis upon which they build a beautiful structure, and then proceed as though their hypothesis were a fact, Plato did not bother himself with *proving* the pre-existence of souls. So, also, Christians who adopt from Plato the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, have conveniently lost sight of the absurd and atheistical doctrine on which it rests. Some of the most eminent of the "Church Fathers," however, and especially Origen, accepted without question all the vagaries of Plato concerning the pre-existence of souls. Proof of this will be given later on.

In a preceding quotation, mention was made of Plato's frequent reference in his treatises to the "obstetrical procedure." The following extract from McClintock and Strong (art. Platonic Philosophy) will serve to explain that term:—

"The midwifery of the mind which Socrates professed, and which Plato represented him as professing, necessitated the assumption that truth was present potentially in

the mind, and that it only required to be drawn from its latent state by adroit handling. It could not be latent, nor could it be brought forth, unless it lay there like a chrysalis, and descended from an anterior condition of being. It was in a superterrestrial and antemundane existence that souls had acquired [*etherial sense*], but before their demission, or return to earth, they had been steeped in oblivion. The acquisition of genuine knowledge was thus the restoration of the obliterated memories of supernal realities."

This theory was the logical outcome of his theory of the pre-existence of souls. In their pre-existent state, as a part of God, they knew all things; in coming into bodies, that knowledge was concealed; it was as though they had been stunned; still the knowledge was there, and the mind could of itself determine truth or error. Thus the mind of man is, according to Plato, the criterion to determine right and wrong. "It is the lord of itself and of all the world besides."

It will not be denied that Plato uttered some truths. It would be difficult, indeed, for any man to be a teacher for so many years, and not occasionally stumble into truth, especially when he had no scruples against receiving anything, provided it was new. But the theory mentioned in the last quotation is more than sufficient to overbalance any good that he might accidentally teach. There is no abominable wickedness that could not find shelter under it. It absolved the possessor of it from all sense of obligation to God, or of necessity of looking to him for wisdom; every man thus became his own god, his own lawgiver, and his own judge. The consequence would most naturally be the conclusion that whatever is, is right; and since "the heart is deceitful

above all things, and desperately wicked," evil came to be regarded as good. This theory and its results are directly pointed out by these words of the apostle:—

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves." Rom. 1 : 22–24.

Whoever reads the fifth book of Plato's "Republic" will find sufficient evidence of his blunted moral sense, or, rather, his total lack of moral sense. In that book, which, like all Plato's works, is in the form of conversations with the young men of Athens, he teaches that women should engage in warfare and all other affairs, equally with the men, and should go through the same course of training as the men, and in the same manner, namely, naked. Says he: "But as for the man who laughs at the idea of undressed women going through gymnastic exercises, as a means of utilizing what is most perfect, his ridicule is but unripe fruit plucked from the tree of wisdom."

He further teaches that in the model republic the women, as well as all property, shall be held in common, and he adds: "It follows from what has been already granted, that the best of both sexes ought to be brought together as often as possible, and the worst as seldom as possible, and that the issue of the former union ought to be reared and that of the latter abandoned."

Those children that should be thought fit to be saved alive, were to be brought up by the State, in a general

nursery, and were never to know their parents, neither were the parents ever to have any further knowledge of their own children. Thus the people were to be "without natural affection." After people attained a certain age, the State was to release its control of their "marriages," and they were to be allowed promiscuous intercourse, only the issue, if any resulted from such unions, was to be destroyed. We beg the reader's pardon for intruding such things upon his notice, but it is absolutely necessary in order to dispel the glamor that has been thrown around Plato. There is a growing tendency to regard Plato as almost a Christian, and as really a forerunner of Christianity. We wish to disabuse as many as possible of this idea, for his influence will be as fatal now as it ever was, to whoever comes under its spell.

We have now all the data necessary to enable us to understand how the "philosophy" of which Plato's is the best sample, would naturally lead to the most absurd and even abominable actions. In the first place we call to mind the fact that the "philosophers" started out in their "search after truth" with no preconceived ideas concerning it, and with no standard but their own minds, by which to test the truthfulness of what they might learn. They professed to be perfectly unprejudiced. According to the Scripture record, they "spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing." Acts 17:21. Like children with toys, they eagerly seized upon each new thought, no matter how contrary it might be to that which they had previously entertained. For the time this new thought excluded everything else, and then it gave place to another new idea.

Many so-called "scientists" of modern times are pur-

suing a similar erratic course. As a consequence many things that a few years ago were held by "scientists" as sacred truth, are now by the same men scouted as folly; and there is no evidence that many "truths" which are now so surely "demonstrated," may not a few years hence be regarded as palpable errors, and be replaced by others equally erroneous. Indeed, there has never been any agreement among "eminent scientists" even on the most vital points, especially as to the formation and age of the world, and the means by which men and animals were placed upon it.

We believe most heartily in true science and philosophy. "Science is knowledge duly arranged and referred to general truths and principles upon which it was founded, and from which it is derived." This is a true definition of true science. Anything which has not the characteristics noted in this definition—anything into which conjecture enters—is not properly science. According to the definition of science, there are certain well-established truths and principles upon which the knowledge which constitutes any science must be founded, and with which it must agree. These principles, therefore, must precede all investigation. They must be so clear to the mind of the would-be scientist, and so firmly believed by him, that they are regarded as self-evident. All doubt concerning them must be settled before he can proceed. They are the foundation of the structure which he is to rear; and no wise mechanic would proceed to lay timbers and build a house upon a foundation of whose stability he was doubtful.

Having settled the first principles, the scientist is ready to investigate phenomena. A new thought is presented

to him. He grasps it, but in so doing he must not jump off from foundation principles. He must not forsake his principles for the new thought, but must bring the new idea to those well-established principles, that it may be tested by them. If it is in harmony with them, he adopts it; if it is antagonistic to those principles, he must unhesitatingly reject it, no matter how pleasing it may appear, or how strongly it may commend itself to his fancy. He is not to measure it by his fancy, but by facts. In this manner he must proceed with every new thought, rejecting those which do not agree with fundamental truth, and placing in their proper position those which do so agree, until he has a beautiful, symmetrical, and perfect structure.

The false scientist may be likened to a wild explorer of new countries. He starts out into the dense forest, or across the trackless waters, until he reaches a country never before visited by man. But, unfortunately, he has neglected to keep his bearings, and therefore has no idea of the relation of this new discovery to the country from which he started. Leaving this, he proceeds to new explorations, but has no idea of their relation to countries already settled. Of what value are his discoveries? Of no value whatever; and the explorer will be extremely fortunate if he ever finds his way back to civilization.

Now the first great principle upon which all true science must rest, is that there is a God who created all things. This is a self-evident truth—a truth that is patent to the mind even of the uneducated savage. Pope's familiar lines,

> "Lo the poor Indian! whose untutored mind
> Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind,"

Express the fact that the existence and power of God are so plainly revealed in nature that the idolater is without excuse, and so the psalmist justly calls the atheist a fool, as one who cannot appreciate even the alphabet of evidence. God, being the Creator of all, must necessarily be the Ruler of all, and the one whom all should obey. The Maker of all worlds must necessarily be superior to all things created, and must be the standard of truth and perfection. That being admitted (and none will deny it; for all who admit that there is a God, also acknowledge his perfection), it follows that his will,—the law by which he governs his creatures,—must also be perfect. Now if we can find anything which, if followed, will produce a perfect character, we shall know that it is God's perfect will; for a perfect character can be formed only by obedience to a perfect law. Such a thing is found in the Bible. Even the atheist will allow that if the Bible were strictly obeyed it would produce perfection of character.

The truth of the Bible may also be demonstrated in another manner. Thus: "The things which are made" reveal the fundamental truth that there is a God, and that he is all-wise and all-powerful. But the Bible is the only book that coincides with this revelation of nature, and makes known to us the existence of God, and his characteristics as shown by his works. Therefore since the Bible, and that alone, is correct on this great fundamental truth, it must be regarded as the surest guide, and as giving the only perfect revelation of the will of Him whom it so accurately describes.

Thus briefly we have shown that the existence of God, and the truthfulness of the Bible as the revelation of his

will, are undeniable truths,—the first self-evident, and the second a necessary consequence of the first. These truths are fundamental, and must be the basis of all true science. Instead, then, of testing the Bible by so-called "science," everything must be brought to the test of the Bible, to determine whether or not it is worthy to be called science. And since God is the originator of all things, it follows that true science is simply a study of God,—a seeking to know his person and attributes. Science, therefore, is endless, since God is infinite. We would not be understood as claiming that the Bible is primarily a book of science, according to the common acceptation of the term, and that from it we may learn the facts of geography, mathematics, physiology, astronomy, etc. But we do mean that it is the sure foundation of all real science; that all of its statements are scientifically correct; that everything may and should be brought to its test; and that whatever disagrees with it, is to be unhesitatingly rejected as false.

From this standpoint it is easy to see why Plato and all the other heathen philosophers did not succeed in finding the truth, and why they did not have any well-defined and systematic theory. In the very beginning they departed from the only source of wisdom: "When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

It may be urged that Plato and the other philosophers held some things that were in themselves true, even if they were not systematically arranged with reference to some great central truth, and therefore it may be asked

how the horrible wickedness which is portrayed in the first chapter of Romans can be directly chargeable to the teachings of philosophy. A few quotations from Scripture make this point clear, and complete the argument concerning heathen philosophy:—

"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also *we all* had our conversation [manner of life] in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh *and of the mind;* and were *by nature* the children of wrath, even as others." Eph. 2:1–3.

"Now *the works of the flesh* are manifest, which *are these:* Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." Gal. 5:19–21.

"And the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for *the imagination of man's heart* is evil from his youth." Gen. 8:21.

"*The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.*" Jer. 17:9.

"*For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies:* these are the things which defile a man." Matt. 15:19, 20.

"The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7.

These scriptures most clearly prove that man is by nature corrupt and depraved. The evil things recorded in Gal. 5: 18–21 are "the works of the flesh;" not those which man has acquired, but things which proceed out of his heart; things which are inherent in his very nature. This being the case, it will be seen at once that whenever a person follows his *natural* inclination, and makes his own mind the criterion of right and wrong, he must inevitably do that which is evil. One of Bacon's rules for guarding against certain forms of error, is based on a recognition of this fact. He says:—

"In general let every student of nature take this as a rule, that whatever his mind seizes and dwells upon with particular satisfaction is to be held in suspicion."

As we have already seen, Plato's philosophy made the human mind the lord of itself and of all of the world beside; he held that the unaided human intellect was competent to decide between truth and error. Therefore his disciples, trusting in themselves alone—"professing themselves to be wise"—could not fail to choose error, and that of the worst description, because error is most congenial to the human mind. The natural heart will choose that which is most like itself; and, since "the heart is deceitful above all things," when truth and error are placed side by side, the heart that is not renewed by divine grace, and completely subject to the law of God, will turn away from the truth and cling to the error. True, some things may be done that in themselves are all right, but, being done from a selfish motive, they become really evil. Love,—love to God and to our fellow-men,—is the sum of all good. Whatever is not the result of such love is only evil. We need not, therefore, be as-

tonished at any error that is held or has been held by mankind. Plato's positively immoral teaching was only the logical result of his "philosophy."

By this time the reader will have no hesitancy in deciding that the heathen philosophers were very unsafe men to follow. Indeed, he will not be at all out of the way if he concludes that any idea advanced by them is to be held in suspicion; that the very fact that Plato or Socrates or Aristotle or Epicurus advocated a given principle is to be considered as strong evidence that such principle is incorrect; and that whatever stands on the sole authority of those philosophers, is to be rejected as false. Not only will these conclusions hold good as regards the heathen philosophers themselves, but also concerning those who put great confidence in those philosophers. And when we learn, as we shall very soon, that many who professed Christianity, still adhered to the pagan philosophy, and regarded it as the forerunner of Christianity, we can better appreciate the earnestness with which the apostle made this exhortation:—

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Col. 2:8.

CHAPTER III.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

In the second paragraph of his famous fifteenth chapter, Gibbon uses the following language:—

"The theologian may indulge the pleasing task of describing religion as she descended from Heaven, arrayed in her native purity. A more melancholy duty is imposed on the historian. He must discover the inevitable mixture of error and corruption which she contracted in a long residence upon earth, among a weak and degenerate race of beings."

So far as the simple religion of Christ is concerned, it is ever the same. The apostle James says: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself *unspotted from the world*." James 1:27. This is ever the characteristic of pure and undefiled religion; but, unfortunately, every good thing is counterfeited, and "among a weak and degenerate race of beings," even though they may be sincere, religion often fails of being correctly represented; and it is therefore the lot of the theologian, as well as of the historian, to discover "the inevitable mixture of error and corruption."

From a failure properly to discriminate between pure religion and the practices of many who *professed* religion, two grave errors have arisen: 1. Infidels have concluded that Christianity is but little, if any, in advance of many forms of heathenism, or of atheism. Judging Christianity by false professors thereof, they lose sight of the fact

that there is such a thing as "pure religion." 2. Believers are in danger of thinking that whatever has been done by "the church" must of necessity be in harmony with religion. This second error is as bad as the first; for in either case the individual will fall far short of the true standard. To know what true religion is, we must look only at the Bible and the life of Christ as therein portrayed. Of all those who have trod this earth, he alone had no sin; in him religion was revealed pure and undefiled. There have been men "of whom the world was not worthy," and yet the record of their lives is not altogether perfect. If we should take for a model the most perfect mortal, we should be led into error; how much greater, then, must be our danger, if we follow those whose lives were far below the standard of pure and undefiled religion.

It is not to be supposed, of course, that Christians would think of taking the course of irreligious people as models for their own lives; but a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and since there have always been irreligious and erring, even though conscientious, people in the professed church, it is evident that whosoever follows "the church" instead of Christ will be led into error. That the *professed* church of Christ has always had in it elements of corruption which would make it an unsafe guide, is as evident as is the fact that Christ has a church here on earth which is composed of frail, erring mortals.

If we go back to the first followers of Christ, we find one who was so utterly base as to sell his Lord for a paltry sum of money. Naturally avaricious, Judas yielded little by little to the temptations of Satan, who always

attacks men on the side of their natural inclination, until the devil finally had complete control of him; yet all this time he was numbered among the followers of Christ.

But the weakness of the early disciples was not confined to Judas. They were all men, and consequently were liable to err even when full of zeal for the Master. James and John wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the Samaritans, because these people were not willing to receive Christ. Jesus rebuked his rash followers, saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." See Luke 9:51–56. Peter, who was so often reproved by Jesus for his hasty spirit, at one time denied his Lord with oaths; and, still later, he used dissimulation to such a degree that Paul was forced to withstand him to the face. Gal. 2:11–14. Even the grave and upright Barnabas was carried away with this dissimulation, which met with such a stern rebuke from Paul. And later these two yoke-fellows, who had labored together under the direction of Heaven, showed that they were still human, by falling into so sharp a contention that they were obliged to separate. Acts 15:36–41.

Let no one think that we speak slightingly of these men. They were divinely appointed to the work, and we honor them as devoted men who hazarded their lives for the sake of Christ, whose chosen servants they were. We love them for what they were, as well as for their work's sake. It was necessary that Christ should commit to men the preaching of the gospel, and those to whom he first committed it were men of like passions with others. They were men who, like those to whom they preached, had to depend on Christ *and go on unto perfection.* And we know of no reason why Inspiration has

placed on record some of their failures, except that we might learn not to look even to the best of men for an example. The message which they bore was pure, but they, in common with all mankind, stood in need of its sanctifying influence; and while they strove to be "ensamples to the flock," they directed the minds of all only to Jesus, the author and finisher of the faith.

If there were imperfections among the immediate disciples of Christ, it is no more than could be expected that those who believed on him through their word would also exhibit human imperfections before they were perfectly sanctified through the truth. And if among the twelve there was one who had a devil, why need we wonder that hypocrites should continually contaminate the church by their presence? Said the apostle Peter, in his letter to the church: "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you." 2 Peter 2: 1–3.

Paul, in his address to the elders of the church at Ephesus, said: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20: 28–30.

These two scriptures show that the inspired apostles knew that there would be not only imperfect, erring members in the church, but also false teachers who, like Judas, would deny the Lord that bought them. Among the elders of the church there were to arise unprincipled men who would bring in "damnable heresies." We need not be surprised, therefore, when we find the professed church soon after the days of the apostles, largely filled with the abominations of heathendom.

Even in the days of the apostles, while their straight testimony was being delivered, this spirit of corruption crept into the church. To the Thessalonians Paul wrote that long before Christ's second advent there would come a "falling away," and that the "man of sin" would be revealed, sitting in the temple of God, virtually professing to be God, and opposing all that pertains to God and his true worship, and then he added that "the mystery of iniquity doth already work." 2 Thess. 2:3–7. Paul knew that even in the churches of his own planting there were elements of corruption that would eventually contaminate the whole body. If we examine the record, we can detect these incipient evils for ourselves.

The church at Corinth was raised up by the personal labors of Paul, yet he was obliged to reprove the members for the spirit of contention and division (1 Cor. 1: 11–13), which was carried so far that they went to law with one another in the heathen courts (1 Cor. 6:6–8). So little spiritual discernment did they have that they made the Lord's Supper an occasion for feasting and drunkenness (1 Cor. 11:17–22); and they tolerated incest of a kind that was disapproved even by the licentious heathen (1 Cor. 5:1, 2), and did not feel that for it they had any cause for shame.

In Paul's second letter to Timothy we find mention of one of the "damnable heresies" which were brought into the church. Says Paul: "But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." 2 Tim. 2:16–18.

A single passage in Paul's letter to the churches in Galatia shows the danger to which all the converts from among the heathen were exposed. Said he: "When ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Gal. 4:8–11. We have already noted some of the immoral practices and senseless ceremonies in the worship of the heathen. Of course the Galatians, in common with all heathen, were given to these before their conversion. And as men when they lose their faith and love, begin to go back to the things to which they were addicted before conversion, so the Galatians were on the point of going back to the "weak and beggarly elements" to which they had formerly been in bondage. They had gone so far back as to "observe days, and months, and times [see Deut. 18:10], and years," and Paul feared that his labor for them had all been thrown away.

Still later the apostle John wrote: "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that

Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." 2 John 7.

Again he wrote to the well-beloved Gaius: "I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church." 3 John 9, 10.

Here was a man in the church setting himself in direct opposition to the apostle John. He was not a private member, but one who had to such a degree the pre-eminence which he loved, that he could cause people to be cast out of the church. This leader in the church refused to receive the instruction which the apostle had written, and cast out of the church those who were willing to receive it. Not content with this, he railed against the inspired servant of the Lord. Surely it cannot with reason be claimed that "the church," even in the apostolic age, ought to be taken as a model.

One more testimony concerning some in the early church must suffice. Another apostle thought it necessary to exhort the faithful to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints, and the following is the reason: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Jude 4. Further on he brings this fearful charge against these men: "But these speak evil of those things which they know not;

but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves." Jude 10. And still further on, the apostle plainly states that bribery was practiced in the church. He says: "These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage." Verse 16.

Our object in quoting these passages has not been to dwell upon the shortcomings of men in the early church, but simply to make prominent the fact that bad men were in the church from the earliest period. There were many good men also in the church at that time; but the question is, How are we to decide as to who were bad and who were good? "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." By comparing their lives with the standard of the Bible, we readily ascertain what actions were good and what were evil.

The true church is the body of Christ; it is composed of those who are indeed united to Christ, who draw strength from him, and who walk as he walked. To the Ephesians the apostle Paul wrote of the mighty power of God, "which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1: 20–23.

To the Colossians he wrote thus concerning Christ:—

"And he is the head of the body, the church; who is

the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Col. 1: 18.

To the Galatian brethren he wrote, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3: 27. And to the church at Corinth he wrote:—

"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12: 12, 13.

From this text it appears that although literal baptism is the sign of union with the church of Christ, the outward sign may exist without the reality, since the real union is a spiritual union. The one who puts on Christ, and thus becomes a son of God, must be born of the Spirit as well as of water. John 3: 5. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8: 9), no matter what his profession may be. Nor is it sufficient to have once received the Spirit of God. Paul exhorts us not to grieve the Spirit of God (Eph. 4: 30) and warns us against doing despite to it (Heb. 10: 29); and our Saviour himself says:—

"Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." John 15: 4, 5.

The fruit which the real member of Christ's body will bear, is the same as that which characterized the life of Christ, for the beloved disciple says: "He that saith

he abideth in him [Christ] ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." 1 John 2 : 6.

Now it is evident from the texts which we have quoted, that the *professed* church is not necessarily identical with the church which is the body of Christ. There are many who profess Christ, and who teach in his name, whom Christ does not recognize. Matt. 7 : 21–23. The gospel net is cast into the sea, and gathers "of every kind." Matt. 13 : 47. But it is not for us always to decide who are and who are not really members of Christ's body; and therefore for convenience' sake we speak of the body of professed believers as "the church." Let it be understood that when this term is used, it is not necessarily synonymous with "Christians."

But these men of whom we have just read in the Bible, were all in "the church;" the evil practices to which they gave themselves were all performed in "the church;" and many of their false doctrines were put forth as the doctrines of "the church" with which they were connected. Now, if we set out to follow "the church," we have no more right to reject the doctrines and practices of these men, than we have to reject any doctrine or practice of "the church." To be sure there were many, at this time no doubt a majority, of those in the church who condemned these men and their ways. But these men also condemned the other class, even casting them out of the church; and all together helped to form "the church."

It is true that our Saviour himself said (Matt. 18 : 17) that whoever would not hear the church should be considered "as an heathen man and a publican." But this does not in the least militate against what has just been

said about following the church. The action of the church of Christ is indeed ratified in Heaven, and no man should lightly esteem its counsels; yet this is an entirely different thing from taking a human model. Christ said to the apostles, "Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ." Matt. 23:10. We are not to follow "the example of the apostles," but the example and words of Christ. He who would continue in the Christian life must ever be "looking unto Jesus."

Jesus is our Pattern; the members of his church become members of his church simply that they may learn of him. A boy goes to school to learn to write, and his teacher writes a line in a beautiful hand, at the top of a page, for him to copy. While he is making his first line, he closely scans the master's line, and does very well. The next time he looks less closely at the copy, and that line is a little poorer than the other. With each successive line he looks less at the copy, and more at his own work, until by the time he is half way down the page he is following, not the master's beautifully written copy, but his own scarcely legible scrawl, and each line is a little worse than the one preceding it. Those lines are a fitting emblem of the lives of those who follow the learners in the school of Christ, instead of following only the life of the great Master himself.

But since there is no man whose life we may take as a model, it is very evident that we cannot follow the entire professed church. To do so would be an impossibility, for even in apostolic times there were in some churches factions that were directly opposed to one another. Therefore if it were claimed that, although it is not allowable to follow the *practice* of any man, we may

follow the belief of the professed church in any age, one important question would have to be settled, and that is, which portion of the church shall be followed? for the entire professed church has never been a unit in matters of belief. We must know which portion has been in the right, for we do not wish to be led astray. The Bible alone can decide this matter. That alone can tell us what is right and what is wrong. And since we must go to the Bible to determine what part of the professed church was following in the footsteps of Christ, and what part was bringing in damnable heresies, it necessarily follows that the Bible itself, and not "the church," or any part of it, is our only guide. "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Ps. 119: 105. And it is for the purpose of emphasizing this important truth that we have asked the reader to look for a moment at the dark side of the church in the days of the apostles.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FATHERS.

In his epistle to the Galatians, the apostle Paul said: "Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. 1: 8. Although the apostles were fallible men, the gospel which they preached, and which they have delivered to us, was perfect. The reason for this is thus given by Paul: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord." 2 Cor. 4: 5. The apostles in their teaching adhered closely to the terms of their divine commission as uttered by Christ, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28: 19, 20. So long as they did this, they simply transmitted the light which came to them direct from Heaven, and so their teaching could be nothing other than perfect. If they had preached themselves, it would have been far different, for they were human.

From the preceding chapter on the apostolic church, by which term we mean simply the church in the days of the apostles, and not that part of the professed church that adhered strictly to "the apostles' doctrine," we have seen that the presence of the apostles themselves did not insure perfection in the church. It insured perfect teaching to the church; but the fact that men have perfect teaching does not make them perfect unless they follow

it and nothing else. Now there are certain men who have acquired great celebrity as "Church Fathers." This term, strangely enough, is never applied to the apostles, to whom it would seem to be more applicable than to any other men, but to certain men who lived in the first few centuries of the Christian era, and who exerted a great influence on the church. As a matter of fact, the true church has but one Father, even God; therefore whatever church recognizes any men as its Fathers, must be a church of merely human planting, having only human ordinances.

It is claimed that the "Fathers" must be competent guides, since they lived so near the days of Christ and the apostles. This is a tacit admission that the gospel which was preached by Christ and the apostles is the true standard. But that has been recorded in the New Testament; and therefore, instead of being obliged to depend on the testimony of any who lived this side of their time, we can go direct to the fountain-head, and can draw therefrom the gospel in as pure a state as though we had listened in person to the teaching of inspired men. The cases of Demas, of Hymenæus and Philetus, of Diotrephes, and others, should be sufficient to teach anybody that mere proximity to the apostles did not fill people with the light of divine truth. Those men are proofs that the light may shine in darkness, and the darkness may not comprehend it. Therefore we must judge of the so-called Fathers, not by the time in which they lived, but by what they did and said. ~~First, however, we will hear what reputable men have to say of them.~~

~~Perhaps we can best begin with the words of~~ Dr.

Adam Clarke, who, in his comment on Proverbs 8, speaks of the Fathers as follows:—

"But of those we may safely state, that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed, that cannot be proved by their authority, nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine their authority is, with me, nothing."

It is this characteristic of the Fathers which makes them so valuable to advocates of a cause which has no Scripture evidence in its support. Let a person once get the idea that the testimony of the Fathers is of value, and you may prove anything to him that you choose. In the *National Baptist*, there appeared an article by the "Rev. Levi Philetus Dobbs, D. D.,"—Dr. Wayland, the editor,—in reply to a young minister who had asked how he could prove a thing to his congregation when there was nothing with which to prove it. Among other things the writer said:—

"I regard, however, a judicious use of the Fathers as being on the whole the best reliance for anyone who is in the situation of my querist. The advantages of the Fathers are twofold: First, they carry a good deal of weight with the masses; and secondly, you can find whatever you want in the Fathers. I do not believe that any opinion could be advanced so foolish, so manifestly absurd, but that you can find passages to sustain it on the pages of these venerable stagers. And to the common mind one of these is just as good as another. If it happens that the point that you want to prove is one that never chanced to occur to the Fathers, why, you can easily show that they would have taken your side if they had only thought of the matter. And if, perchance, there is nothing bearing even remotely or constructively on the point, do not be discouraged; get a good, strong quota-

tion, and put the name of the Fathers to it, and utter it with an air of triumph; it will be all just as well; nine-tenths of the people do not stop to ask whether a quotation bears on the matter in hand. Yes, my brother, the Fathers are your stronghold. They are Heaven's best gift to the man who has a cause that cannot be sustained in any other way." *March 7, 1878.*

While the above is written in a humorous vein, it is strictly in harmony with the quotation taken from Dr. Clarke, and is in harmony with the facts in the case. The reader shall have a chance to judge of this matter for himself as we proceed.

We quote again from Mosheim. Speaking of certain works by Clement, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, and others, he says that these works are lost, and adds:—

"But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They all believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell; and neglecting the former, as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meaning."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 5.*

In one of his latest works, "The History of Interpretation," Archdeacon Farrar says of the Fathers:—

"There are but few of them whose pages are not rife with errors,—errors of method, errors of fact, errors of history, of grammar, and even of doctrine. This is the language of simple truth, not of slighting disparagement."—*Pp. 162, 163.*

Again, on page 164 of the same book, Farrar says:—

"Without deep learning, without linguistic knowledge, without literary culture, without any final principles either as to the nature of the sacred writings or the method by which they should be interpreted—surrounded by Paganism, Judaism, and heresy of every description, and wholly dependent on a faulty translation—the earliest Fathers and apologists add little or nothing to our understanding of Scripture. . . . Their acquaintance with the Old Testament is incorrect, popular, and full of mistakes; their scriptural arguments are often baseless; their exegesis—novel in application only—is a chaos of elements unconsciously borrowed on the one hand from Philo, and on the other from Rabbis and Kabbalists. They claim 'a grace' of exposition, which is not justified by the results they offer, and they suppose themselves to be in possession of a Christian Gnosis, of which the specimens offered are for the most part entirely untenable."

These quotations from Farrar should have more than ordinary weight in this matter, for, besides the Catholic Church, there is no other church that depends so much upon the Fathers as does the Church of England, or Episcopal Church.

In the last quotation from Farrar, this expression occurs: "Surrounded by Paganism, Judaism, and heresy of every description," etc. This seems to be forgotten by most people who laud the Fathers. They speak of them as living near the time of the apostles, but overlook the fact that they lived still nearer to another time, namely, the time of gross paganism. Now if their character were to be determined by the character of the people to whom they were nearest in point of time, we submit that the antecedent probability that they would assume the color

of paganism, is greater than that they would assume the color of Christianity.

"But," says one, "there is this element in their favor, and against the idea that they were influenced more by paganism than by Christianity: they professed Christianity, and combated paganism; they studied the works of the apostles, and so took on their character."

This is a great mistake. As a matter of fact, the so-called Fathers studied the works of pagan philosophers far more than they did those of the apostles. They affected to be philosophers themselves; and while they did indeed make a show of combating paganism, the weapons which they used were drawn from pagan philosophy more frequently than from the Bible. And even when they quoted from the Bible, their pagan notions warped their interpretation. So in their encounters with paganism, we have for the most part nothing but one form of paganism arrayed against another form of paganism. On this point De Quincey, in his essay on "The Pagan Oracles," says:—

"But here and everywhere, speaking of the Fathers as a body, we charge them with antichristian practices of a twofold order: Sometimes as supporting their great cause in a spirit alien to its own, retorting in a temper not less uncharitable than that of their opponents; sometimes, again, as adopting arguments that are unchristian in their ultimate grounds; resting upon errors the refutation of errors, upon superstitions the overthrow of superstitions; and drawing upon the armories of darkness for weapons that, to be durable, ought to have been of celestial temper. Alternately, in short, the Fathers trespass against those affections which furnish to Christianity its moving powers, and against those truths which furnish to Christianity its guiding lights. Indeed, Milton's memo-

rable attempt to characterize the Fathers as a body, contemptuous as it is, can hardly be challenged as overcharged.

"Never in any instance were these aberrations of the Fathers more vividly exemplified than in their theories upon the pagan oracles. On behalf of God, they were determined to be wiser than God; and, in demonstration of scriptural power, to advance doctrines which the Scriptures had nowhere warranted."

Much more testimony to the same effect will be adduced as we proceed. We will now listen to another statement from Mosheim. In his account of the Christian church in the second century, he says:—

"The controversial writers who distinguished themselves in this century, encountered either the Jews, or the worshipers of idol gods, or the corrupters of the Christian doctrine and the founders of new sects, that is, the heretics. With the Jews, contended in particular Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho; and likewise Tertullian; but neither of them, in the best manner; because they were not acquainted with the language and history of the Hebrews, and did not duly consider the subject. The pagans were assailed by those especially, who wrote apologies for the Christians; as Athenagoras, Melito, Quadratus, Miltiades, Aristides, Tatian, and Justin Martyr; or who composed addresses to the pagans; as Justin, Tertullian, Clement, and Theophilus of Antioch."

"A man of sound judgment who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lacked discernment, knowledge, application, good arrangement, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as are suited rather to embarrass the mind than to convince the understanding."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 7.*

In the same chapter (section 10), Mosheim sums up the case concerning the Fathers as follows:—

"To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle pious emotions; but also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the stoic and academic philosophy; many things vague and indeterminate; and many things positively false, and inconsistent with the precepts of Christ. If one deserves the title of a bad master in morals, who has no just ideas of the proper boundaries and limitations of Christian duties, nor clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor a perception of those general principles to which recurrence should be had in all discussions respecting Christian virtue, and therefore very often talks at random, and blunders in expounding the divine laws; though he may say many excellent things, and excite in us considerable emotion; then I can readily admit that in strict truth, this title belongs to many of the Fathers."

After reading the above, we are not surprised that, in harmony with Dr. Clarke and the "Rev. Levi Philetus Dobbs," Mosheim says:—

"It is therefore not strange, that all sects of Christians can find in what are called the Fathers, something to favor their own opinions and systems."

This is strictly true; but although "these venerable stagers" sometimes stumbled upon the truth, they furnish the most aid and comfort to those sects which pursue the most unscriptural practices, as, for instance, the Catholics and the Mormons. It is very seldom that their testimony is quoted in behalf of any really scriptural doctrine or custom.

To show that these so-called Fathers are not only faulty in matters of doctrine, but are also untrustworthy as to matters of fact, we quote from Mosheim, who asserts that,—

THEY USED FALSEHOODS IN THEIR CONTROVERSIES.

Says that writer:—

"But it must by no means pass unnoticed, that the discussions instituted against the opposers of Christianity in this age, departed far from the primitive simplicity, and the correct method of controversy. For the Christian doctors, who were in part educated in the schools of rhetoricians and sophists, inconsiderately transferred the arts of these teachers to the cause of Christianity; and therefore considered it of no importance, whether an antagonist were confounded by base artifices, or by solid arguments. Thus that mode of disputing, which the ancients called *economical*, and which had victory rather than truth for its object, was almost universally approved. And the Platonists contributed to the currency of the practice, by asserting that it was no sin for a person to employ falsehood and fallacies for the support of truth, when it was in danger of being borne down."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 3, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 10.*

In his "Ecclesiastical Commentaries," Mosheim also says:—

"By some of the weaker brethren, in their anxiety to assist God with all their might [in the propagation of the Christian faith], such dishonest artifices were occasionally resorted to, as could not, under any circumstances, admit of excuse, and were utterly unworthy of that sacred cause which they were unquestionably intended to support. Perceiving, for instance, in what vast repute the poetical effusions of those ancient prophetesses, termed Sybils, were held by the Greeks and Romans, some Christian, or rather, perhaps, an association of Christians, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, composed eight books of Sybilline verses, made up of prophecies respecting Christ and his kingdom. . . . Many other deceptions of this sort, to which custom has very improperly given the denomination of *pious* frauds, are known to have been practiced

in this and the succeeding century. The authors of them were, in all probability, actuated by no ill intention, but this is all that can be said in their favor, for their conduct in this respect was certainly most ill-advised and unwarrantable. Although the greater part of those who were concerned in these forgeries on the public, undoubtedly belonged to some heretical sect or other, and particularly to that class which arrogated to itself the pompous denomination of Gnostics, I yet cannot take upon me to acquit even the most strictly orthodox from all participation in this species of criminality; for it appears from evidence superior to all exception, that a pernicious maxim, which was current in the schools not only of the Egyptians, the Platonists, and the Pythagoreans, but also of the Jews, was very early recognized by the Christians, and soon found amongst them numerous patrons, namely, that those who made it their business to deceive with a view of promoting the cause of truth, were deserving rather of commendation than censure.—*Century 2, sec. 7.*

Let the reader refresh his memory with what has been written concerning heathen philosophy, and how it tended directly toward a lax condition of morals, and then when he learns that the so-called Christian Fathers made this heathen philosophy their constant study, he will not be surprised that they should have but little regard for strict truth. That some of the most renowned Fathers not only stutied philosophy, but also were known as teachers of philosophy even after they professed Christianity, is not a matter of question. Mosheim, after showing, as we have quoted, how rapidly the church degenerated, says:—

"The external change thus wrought in the constitution of the church would have been, however, far less detrimental to the interests of Christianity, had it not been accompanied by others of an internal nature, which

struck at the very vitals of religion, and tended, in no small degree, to affect the credit of those sacred writings on which the entire system of Christian discipline relies for support. Of these the most considerable and important are to be attributed to a taste for the cultivation of philosophy and human learning, which, during the preceding century, if not altogether treated with neglect and contempt by the Christians, had at least been wisely kept under, and by no means permitted to blend itself with religion; but in the age of which we are now treating, burst forth on a sudden into a flame, and spread itself with the utmost rapidity throughout a considerable part of the church. This may be accounted for, in some measure, from its having been the practice of the many Greek philosophers, who, in the course of this century, were induced to embrace Christianity, not only to retain their pristine denomination, garb, and mode of living, but also to persist in recommending the study of philosophy, and initiating youth therein. In proof of this, we may, from amidst numerous other examples, adduce in particular that of Justin, the celebrated philosopher and martyr. The immediate nursery and very cradle, as it were, of Christian philosophy, must, however, be placed in the celebrated seminary which long flourished at Alexandria under the denomination of the catechetical school. For the persons who presided therein, in the course of the age of which we are treating, namely, Pantænus, Athenagoras, and Clement of Alexandria, not only engaged with ardor in the cultivation of philosophy themselves, but also exerted their influence in persuading those whom they were educating for the office of teachers in the church, to follow their example in this respect, and make it their practice to associate philosophical principles with those of religion."—*Historical Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 25.*

The same writer says of the Fathers of the second century:—

"The philosophers and learned men, who came over to

the Christians in this century, were no inconsiderable protection and ornament to this holy religion by their discussions, their writings, and their talents. But if any are disposed to question whether the Christian cause received more benefit than injury from these men, I must confess myself unable to decide the point. For the noble simplicity and the majestic dignity of the Christian religion were lost, or, at least, impaired when these philosophers presumed to associate their dogmas with it, and to bring faith and piety under the dominion of human reason."—*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part 1, chap. 1, sec. 12.*

This is certainly a very mild view of the case. There can be no question but that the philosophers who came over to the church, bringing their philosophical dogmas with them, were an unmitigated curse to Christianity. "Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savor." So the heathen customs and manners of thought which these men incorporated into the Christian church, corrupted the whole body. Their very learning made them the more detrimental to true Christianity; for it caused them to be looked up to as "leaders of Christian thought," and their philosophy was but "vain deceit," and their science only that which is "falsely so called."

This conclusion will be the more apparent when we remember that these men were ignorant of the Bible just about in proportion as they were skilled in "philosophy." Dr. Killen gives a brief history of each one of the early Fathers, and then adds:—

"The preceding account of the Fathers of the second and third centuries may enable us to form some idea of the value of these writers as ecclesiastical authorities. Most of them had reached maturity before they embraced

the faith of the gospel, so that, with a few exceptions, they wanted the advantages of an early Christian education. Some of them, before their conversion, had bestowed much time and attention on the barren speculations of the pagan philosophers; and, after their reception into the bosom of the church, they still continued to pursue the same unprofitable studies. Cyprian, one of the most eloquent of these Fathers, had been baptized only about two years before he was elected bishop of Carthage; and, during his comparatively short episcopate, he was generally in a turmoil of excitement, and had, consequently, little leisure for reading or mental cultivation. Such a writer is not entitled to command confidence as an expositor of the faith once delivered to the saints. Even in our own day, with all the facilities supplied by printing for the rapid accumulation of knowledge, no one would expect much spiritual instruction from an author who would undertake the office of an interpreter of Scripture two years after his conversion from heathenism. The Fathers of the second and third centuries were not regarded as safe guides even by their Christian contemporaries. . . . Tertullian, who, in point of learning, vigor, and genius, stands at the head of the Latin writers of this period, was connected with a party of gloomy fanatics. Origen, the most voluminous and erudite of the Greek Fathers, was excommunicated as a heretic. If we estimate these authors, as they were appreciated by the early Church of Rome, we must pronounce their writings of little value. Tertullian, as a Montanist, was under the ban of the Roman bishop. Hippolytus could not have been a favorite with either Zephyrinus or Callistus, for he denounced both as heretics. Origen was treated by the Roman Church as a man under sentence of excommunication. Stephen deemed even Cyprian unworthy of ecclesiastical fellowship, because the Carthaginian prelate maintained the propriety of rebaptizing heretics."

VAGARIES OF THE FATHERS.

"Nothing can be more unsatisfactory, or rather childish, than the explanations of Holy Writ sometimes given by these ancient expositors. According to Tertullian, the two sparrows mentioned in the New Testament signify the soul and the body; and Clemens Alexandrinus gravely pleads for marriage from the promise—'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' Cyprian produces as an argument in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, that the Jews observed 'the third, sixth, and ninth hours' as their 'fixed and lawful seasons for prayer.' Origen represents the heavenly bodies as literally engaged in acts of devotion. If these authorities are to be credited, the Gihon, one of the rivers of Paradise, was no other than the Nile. Very few of the Fathers of this period were acquainted with Hebrew, so that, as a class, they were miserably qualified for the interpretation of the Scriptures. Even Origen himself must have had a very imperfect knowledge of the language of the Old Testament. In consequence of their literary deficiencies, the Fathers of the second and third centuries occasionally commit the most ridiculous blunders. Thus, Irenæus tells us that the name *Jesus* in Hebrew consists of two letters and a *half*, and describes it as signifying 'that Lord who contains Heaven and earth'! This Father asserts also that the Hebrew word *adonai*, or the Lord, denotes 'utterable and wonderful.' Clemens Alexandrinus is not more successful as an interpreter of the sacred tongue of the chosen people; for he asserts that Jacob was called *Israel* 'because he had seen the Lord God,' and he avers that *Abraham* means 'the elect father of a sound!'"—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraphs 31, 32.*

Upon this the same writer makes the following most just comments, which make a fitting close to this collection of statements concerning the Fathers:—

"It would seem as if the great Head of the church permitted these early writers to commit the grossest mistakes, and to propound the most foolish theories, for the express purpose of teaching us that we are not implicitly to follow their guidance. It might have been thought that authors, who flourished on the borders of apostolic times, knew more of the mind of the Spirit than others who appeared in succeeding ages; but the truths of Scripture, like the phenomena of the visible creation, are equally intelligible to all generations. If we possess spiritual discernment, the trees and the flowers will display the wisdom and the goodness of God as distinctly to us as they did to our first parents; and, if we have the 'unction from the Holy One,' we may enter into the meaning of the Scriptures as fully as did Justin Martyr or Irenæus [and to a far greater degree, for their minds were blinded and fettered by their false philosophy]. To assist us in the interpretation of the New Testament, we have at command a critical apparatus of which they were unable to avail themselves. Jehovah is jealous of the honor of his word, and he has inscribed in letters of light over the labors of the most ancient interpreters—'*Cease ye from man.*' The 'opening of the Scriptures,' so as to exhibit their beauty, their consistency, their purity, their wisdom, and their power, is the clearest proof that the commentator is possessed of 'the key of knowledge.' When tried by this test, Thomas Scott or Matthew Henry is better entitled to confidence than either Origen or Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Bible is its own safest expositor. 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.'"—*The Ancient Church, sec. 2, chap. 1, last paragraph.*

First in order come what are called

THE "APOSTOLIC FATHERS,"

Concerning whom in particular a few words must be said. The following from the "Encyclopedia Britan-

nica" will introduce and outline this part of the subject better than anything that we could write:—

"The Apostolic Fathers is a name given to certain writers in the earliest period of Christianity, who were believed to have been the disciples of the apostles, and to have had intercourse with them. Those generally included under the title are Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas, and Hermas. Sometimes the name is extended to Papias of Hierapolis, and the writer of the epistle to Diognetus. A critical examination of the writings attributed to these men, and a critical sifting of the traditions which we have in relation to their history, bring out the circumstance that the name is unsuitable. Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, and Hermas were supposed to be persons mentioned in the New Testament; but criticism proves conclusively that this is a mistake in regard to Barnabas and Hermas, and possibly also in regard to Clemens. Polycarp, in all probability, and according to the best testimony, had intercourse with apostles, but it was in his early youth; and his letter belongs to a period considerably later than that of the apostles. The epistles of Ignatius, as well as the personal history of that martyr, are involved in great obscurity, and critics differ widely in regard to both."

In his "Introductory Notice" to the "Apostolic Fathers," Bishop Coxe says of them:—

"Disappointment may be the first emotion of the student who comes down from the mount where he has dwelt in the tabernacles of evangelists and apostles; for these disciples are confessedly inferior to the masters; they speak with the voices of infirm and fallible men, and not like the New Testament writers, with the fiery tongues of the Holy Ghost."

"Their very mistakes enable us to attach a higher value to the superiority of inspired writers. They were not wiser than the naturalists of their day who taught them the history of the Phœnix and other fables; but

nothing of this sort is found in Scripture. The Fathers are inferior in kind as well as degree."

Neander speaks of the writings attributed to the so-called Apostolic Fathers, as follows:—

"The next ecclesiastical writers who come after the apostles, are the so-called Apostolic Fathers (*Patres Apostolici*), who come from the apostolic age, and must have been the disciples of the apostles. The remarkable difference between the writings of the apostles and those of the Apostolic Fathers, who are yet so close upon the former in point of time, is a remarkable phenomenon of its kind. While in other cases such a transition is usually quite gradual, in this case we find a sudden one. Here there is no gradual transition, but a sudden spring; a remark which is calculated to lead us to a recognition of the peculiar activity of the divine Spirit in the souls of the apostles."—*Rose's Neander, p. 407.*

Again he says:—

"The writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers are, alas! come down to us, for the most part, in a very uncertain condition; partly, because in early times writings were counterfeited under the name of those venerable men of the church, in order to propagate certain opinions or principles; partly, because those writings which they had really published were adulterated, and especially so to serve a Judæo-hierarchical party, which would fain crush the free evangelical spirit."—*Ib.*

It will be seen that Neander supposes that the writings are partly, at least, the genuine productions of the men whose names they bear; but he acknowledges that, even if genuine, they have been counterfeited and adulterated till there is no confidence to be placed in them, either as to matters of doctrine or matters of fact. This conclusion we may now verify, as we examine them in detail.

CHAPTER V.

THE "EPISTLE OF BARNABAS."

THE famous essay on "Snakes in Ireland" consisted of but three words, namely, "There are none." In like manner might we dispose of the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas," for there is no such thing. In proof of this statement we offer the following testimony:—

"An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him. . . . The writer evidently was unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed the blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed."—*McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, art. Barnabas, Epistle of.*

The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says:—

"The internal evidence is conclusive against its genuineness."

Mosheim says:—

"The epistle that has come down to us with the name of Barnabas affixed to it, and which consists of two parts, the one comprising proofs of the divinity of the Christian religion derived from the books of the Old Testament, the other, a collection of moral precepts, is unquestionably a composition of great antiquity, but we are left in uncertainty as to its author. For as to what is suggested by some, of its having been written by that Barnabas who was the friend and companion of St. Paul, the futility of such a notion is easily to be made apparent from the letter itself; several of the opinions and interpretations of Scripture which it contains, having in in them so little of either truth, dignity, or force, as to

render it impossible that they could ever have proceeded from the pen of a man divinely instructed."—*Eccl. Com., cent. 1, sec. 53.*

Neander says:—

"It is impossible that we should acknowledge this epistle to belong to that Barnabas, who was worthy to be the companion of the apostolic labors of St. Paul, and had received his name from the power of his animated discourses in the churches. We find a different spirit breathing throughout it, than that of such an apostolic man. We perceive in it a Jew of Alexandrian education, who had embraced Christianity, who was prepared by his Alexandrian education for a spiritual conception of Christianity; but who set too high a value on his Alexandrian and Jewish Gnosis, who looked for especial wisdom in a mystical and fanciful interpretation of the Old Testament, more resembling the spirit of Philo than that of St. Paul, or even that of the epistle to the Hebrews, and who indulged himself in such interpretations in a silly manner."—*P. 407.*

In his "Ecclesiastical History," Mosheim again says:—

"The epistle of Barnabas as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first] or the next, who had no bad intentions, but possessed little genius and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different person from Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul."—*Book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 21.*

Yet so little is really known of the one who really wrote this epistle that while these writers suppose him to have been a Jew, and of the first century, the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says:—

"The opinion to-day is, that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria, at

the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian."

Dr. Schaff, in his "History of the Christian Church" (section 121), says:—

"The writings which have come down to us under the names of Barnabas and Hermas are of uncertain origin, and inferior to the other productions of the Apostolic Fathers in matter as well as in sound simplicity, and contain many elements which we must ascribe to a later generation."

"A genuine production of Barnabas would doubtless have found a place in the Canon, with the writings of Mark and Luke, and the epistle to the Hebrews. Besides, the contents of this epistle are not worthy of him. It has many good ideas, and valuable testimonies, such as that in favor of the observance of the Christian Sabbath. But it goes to extremes in opposition to Judaism, and indulges in all sorts of artificial, sometimes absurd, allegorical fancies."

To be sure he does, but what of it? What if the epistle is a forgery made by some unknown and irresponsible person? What if its writer was an ignoramus who indulged in the most absurd fancies? So long as it gives "valuable testimonies" in favor of the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," it will undoubtedly be considered worthy of an honored place in "Christian literature." The friends of the Sunday sabbath could not make a more perfect exhibit of the scarcity of argument in its behalf, than by saying that the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas" contains "valuable testimonies" in its favor. How valuable those testimonies are we shall soon see.

Kitto's "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge" (article Barnabas) says of the writer of this epistle:—

"He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; his views of the Old Economy are confused and erroneous; and he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable, that Barnabas, 'the son of prophecy,' 'the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,' was not the author of this epistle."

And in the article on "The Lord's Day," the so-called Epistle of Barnabas is spoken of as "probably a forgery of the second century."

Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, in his introductory note to the epistle as published by the Christian Literature Publishing Company, says:—

"The writer of this epistle is supposed to have been an Alexandrian Jew of the times of Trajan and Hadrian. He was a layman; but possibly he bore the name of 'Barnabas,' and so has been confounded with his holy apostolic name-sire."

And the original introductory note by the translators of the epistle for the Edinburgh edition, contains the following:—

"Nothing certain is known as to the author of the following epistle. The writer's name is Barnabas, but scarcely any scholars now ascribe it to the illustrious friend and companion of St. Paul. . . . On perusing the epistle, the reader will be in circumstances to judge of this matter for himself. He will be led to consider whether the spirit and tone of the writing, as so decidedly opposed to all respect for Judaism—the numerous inaccuracies which it contains with respect to Mosaic enactments and observances—the absurd and trifling interpretations of Scripture which it suggests—and the many silly vaunts of superior knowledge in which its writer indulges—can possibly comport with its ascrip-

tion to the fellow-laborer of St. Paul. When it is remembered that no one ascribes the epistle to the apostolic Barnabas till the times of Clement of Alexandria, and that it is ranked by Eusebius among the 'spurious' writings, which, however much known and read in the church, were never regarded as authoritative, little doubt can remain that the external evidence is of itself weak, and should not make us hesitate for a moment in refusing to ascribe this writing to Barnabas the apostle. . . . In point of style, both as respects thought and expression, a very low place must be assigned it. We know nothing certain of the region in which the author lived, or where the first readers were to be found."

It will now be in place to quote a few passages from the famous document, that our readers may judge for themselves of its character. And first we shall quote the "valuable testimonies" "in favor of the observance" of Sunday. All that is said on this subject is contained in chapter 15 of the epistle, which we quote entire:—

"Further, also, it is written concerning the Sabbath in the decalogue which (the Lord) spoke, face to face, to Moses on Mount Sinai, 'And sanctify ye the Sabbath of the Lord with clean hands and a pure heart.' And he says in another place, 'If my sons keep the Sabbath, then will I cause my mercy to rest upon them.' The Sabbath is mentioned at the beginning of the creation (thus): 'And God made in six days the works of his hands, and made an end on the seventh day, and rested on it, and sanctified it.' Attend, my children, to the meaning of this expression, 'He finished in six days.' This implieth that the Lord will finish all things in six thousand years, for a day is with him a thousand years. And he himself testified, saying, 'Behold, to-day will be as a thousand years.' Therefore, my children, in six days, that is, in six thousand years, all things will be finished. 'And he rested on the seventh day.' This

meaneth: when his Son, coming (again), shall destroy the time of the wicked man, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun, and the moon, and the stars, then shall he truly rest on the seventh day. Moreover, he says, 'Thou shalt sanctify it with pure hands and a pure heart.' If, therefore, anyone can now sanctify the day which God has sanctified, except he is pure in heart in all things, we are deceived. Behold, therefore: certainly then one properly resting sanctifies it, when we ourselves, having received the promise, wickedness no longer existing, and all things having been made new by the Lord, shall be able to work righteousness. Then we shall be able to sanctify it, having been first sanctified ourselves. Further, he says to them, 'Your new moons and your Sabbaths I cannot endure.' Ye perceive how he speaks: Your present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that is which I have made (namely this), when, giving rest to all things, I shall make a beginning of the eighth day, that is, a beginning of another world. Wherefore, also, we keep the eighth day with joyfulness, the day also on which Jesus rose again from the dead. And when he had manifested himself, he ascended into the heavens."

That is the whole of it. It is useless to try to analyze it, because it doesn't mean anything. The writer misquotes Scripture, and manufactures it when he doesn't find any to suit his purpose. He also allegorizes the plainest statements of fact, and strings words together in such a way as to defy comprehension by the most acute grammarian. But all of this can be overlooked so long as he mentions the "eighth day," and thus furnishes "valuable testimony" for the observance of Sunday.

This chapter alone sufficiently proves the truth of the statement that the epistle contains "absurd and trifling interpretations of Scripture," but we will give a few more instances. In the last part of chapter 9 there is some in-

formation which the writer of the epistle considered the most valuable of any he had to bestow. We quote:—

"Learn then, my children, concerning all things richly, that Abraham, the first who enjoined circumcision, looking forward in spirit to Jesus, practiced that rite, having received the mysteries of the three letters. For (the Scripture) saith, 'And Abraham circumcised ten, and eight, and three hundred men of his household.' What, then, was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus donated—Ten by I, and eight by H. You have (the initials of the name of) Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace (of our redemption) by the letter T, he says also, 'Three Hundred.' He signifies, therefore, Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this, who has put within us the engrafted gift of his doctrine. No one has been admitted by me to a more excellent piece of knowledge than this, but I know that ye are worthy."

This is truly an astonishing and most excellent piece of information! Archdeacon Farrar says of it:—

"It never even occurred to Barnabas or to any who adopted this singular specimen of exposition that there was any absurdity in attributing to a Chaldean Emir an application of mystic processes and numerical values to the letters of an alphabet which had no existence till hundreds of years after he had returned to dust."—*History of Interpretation, p. 168.*

But although the egotistical pseudo-Barnabas considered this the most "excellent piece of knowledge" that he had condescended to share with the common crowd, the chapter immediately following (chapter 10) certainly surpasses it in that sort of wisdom. Although it is quite long, we quote the whole of it, that the reader may see the caliber of the man who wrote this epistle.

The chapter is entitled, "Spiritual Significance of the Precepts of Moses Respecting Different Kinds of Food," and reads as follows:—

"Now, wherefore did Moses say, 'Thou shalt not eat the swine, nor the eagle, nor the hawk, nor the raven, nor any fish which is not possessed of scales'? He embraced three doctrines in his mind (in doing so). Moreover, the Lord saith to them in Deuteronomy, 'And I will establish my ordinances among this people.' Is there then not a command of God that they should not eat (these things)? There is, but Moses spoke with a spiritual reference. For this reason he named the swine, as much as to say, 'Thou shalt not join thyself to men who resemble swine.' For when they live in pleasure, they forget their Lord; but when they come to want, they acknowledge the Lord. And (in like manner) the swine, when it has eaten, does not recognize its master; but when hungry it cries out, and on receiving food is quiet again. 'Neither shalt thou eat,' says he, 'the eagle, nor the hawk, nor the kite, nor the raven.' 'Thou shalt not join thyself,' he means, 'to such men as know not how to procure food for themselves by labor and sweat, but seize on that of others in their iniquity, and although wearing an aspect of simplicity, are on the watch to plunder others.' So these birds, while they sit idle, inquire how they may devour the flesh of others, proving themselves pests (to all) by their wickedness. 'And thou shalt not eat,' he says, 'the lamprey, or the polypus, or the cuttle-fish.' He means, 'Thou shalt not join thyself or be like to such men as are ungodly to the end, and are condemned to death.' In like manner as those fishes, above accursed, float in the deep, not swimming (on the surface) like the rest, but make their abode in the mud which lies at the bottom. Moreover, 'Thou shalt not,' he says, 'eat the hare.' Wherefore? 'Thou shalt not be a corrupter of boys, nor like unto such.' Because the hare multiplies, year by year, the places of its con-

ception; for as many years as it lives so many [places of conception] it has. Moreover, 'Thou shalt not eat the hyena.' He means, 'Thou shalt not be an adulterer, nor a corrupter, nor be like to them that are such.' Wherefore? Because that animal annually changes its sex, and is at one time male, and at another female. Moreover, he has rightly detested the weasel. For he means, 'Thou shalt not be like to those whom we hear of as committing wickedness with the mouth, on account of their uncleanness; nor shalt thou be joined to those impure women who commit iniquity with the mouth. For this animal conceives by the mouth.'" Moses then issued three doctrines concerning meats with a spiritual significance; but they received them according to fleshly desire, as if he had merely spoken of (literal) meats. David, however, comprehends the knowledge of the three doctrines, and speaks in like manner: 'Blessed is the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly,' even as the fishes (referred to) go in darkness to the depths (of the sea); 'and hath not stood in the way of sinners,' even as those who profess to fear the Lord, but go astray like swine; 'and hath not sat in the seat of scorners,' even as those birds that lie in wait for prey. Take a full and firm grasp of this spiritual knowledge. But Moses says still further, 'Ye shall eat every animal that is cloven-footed and ruminant.' What does he mean? (The ruminant animal denotes him) who, on receiving food, recognizes him that nourishes him, and being satisfied by him, is visibly made glad. Well spake (Moses), having respect to the commandment. What, then, does he mean? That we ought to join ourselves to those that fear the Lord, those who meditate in their heart on the commandment which they have received, those who both utter the judgments of the Lord and observe them, those who know that meditation is a work of gladness, and who ruminate upon the word of the Lord. But what means the cloven-footed? That the righteous man also walks in this world, yet looks

forward to the holy state (to come). Behold how well Moses legislated. But how was it possible for them to understand or comprehend these things? We then, rightly understanding his commandments, explain them as the Lord intended. For this purpose he circumcised our ears and our hearts, that we might understand these things."

Such is the nature of this epistle, which even to-day is quoted as containing "valuable testimony" in behalf of Sunday observance. Certainly the thoughtful reader cannot fail to see that scarcely any stronger indictment could be brought against the Sunday institution than the fact that it draws testimony for its support from such a source. It is true that Sunday advocates say that they do not depend upon this testimony; but we notice that they never fail to quote it. The simple knowledge that the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas" is quoted in behalf of any doctrine or practice, should be sufficient evidence that such doctrine or practice is unworthy of belief. With this we leave the pseudo-Barnabas.

W.

CHAPTER VI.

HERMAS AND CLEMENT.

"PASTOR (OR SHEPHERD) OF HERMAS."

THIS is the title of a collection of visions, commandments, and similitudes, which were written sometime in the second century by some person not known. From the fact that the writer calls himself Hermas, some have jumped to the conclusion that the writer was the friend of Paul (Rom. 16:14), but no one now attributes its production to him. It is now quite generally supposed that he was a brother of Pius I., who was bishop of Rome from 143 to 157 A. D. Mosheim says:—

"The book entitled 'The Shepherd of Hermas' (so called, because an angel, in the form and habit of a shepherd, is the leading character in the drama), was composed in the second century by Hermas, the brother of Pius the Roman bishop. The writer, if he was indeed sane, deemed it proper to forge dialogues held with God and angels in order to insinuate what he regarded as salutary truths, more effectually into the minds of his readers. But his celestial spirits talk more insipidly than our scavengers and porters."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 21.*

In the "Ecclesiastical Commentaries" (cent. 1, sec. 54) he again says of the book:—

"There is such an admixture of folly and superstition with piety, such a ridiculous association of the most egregious nonsense with things momentous and useful, not only in the celestial visions which constitute the substance of his first book, but also in the precepts and

parables which are put into the mouth of the angel in the two others, as to render it a matter of astonishment that men of learning should ever have thought of giving Hermas a place amongst the inspired writers. To me it appears clear that he must have been either a wild, disordered fanatic, or else, as is more likely, a man who, by way of more readily drawing the attention of his brethren to certain maxims and precepts which he deemed just and salutary, conceived himself to be warranted in pretending to have derived them from conversations with God and the angels."

In note 2 to the above section, Mosheim says:—

"Several things, which I cannot well enter into in this place, conspire to impress me with the opinion that Hermas could never have been so far the dupe of an overheated imagination, as to fancy that he saw and heard things which in reality had no existence, but that he knowingly and willfully was guilty of a cheat, and invented those divine conversations and visions which he asserts himself to have enjoyed, with a view to obtain a more ready reception for certain precepts and admonitions which he conceived would prove salutary to the Roman Church. At the time when he wrote, it was an established maxim with many of the Christians, that it was pardonable in an advocate for religion to avail himself of fraud and deception, if it were likely that they might conduce towards the attainment of any considerable good."

And the note concludes as follows:—

"The 'Pastor of Hermas' is a fictitious work, of much the same kind with what are termed the 'Clementina' and the 'Recognitions of Clement.' In its plan however it is somewhat inferior to these, as instead of mortal characters conversing, we have the Deity himself, and his ministers or angels introduced on the scene."

There is no reference in the "Pastor of Hermas" to

Sunday or to Sunday observance, but, as the translator says in his introductory note—

"The work is very important in many respects; but especially as reflecting the tone and style of books which interested and instructed the Christians of the second and third centuries."

Its importance in this respect will be more apparent, after we have given a few specimens of its style. But first we wish to show how it was regarded by the churches of that date. From the translator's introductory notice we extract the following:—

"The 'Pastor of Hermas' was one of the most popular books, if not the most popular book, in the Christian church during the second, third, and fourth centuries. It occupied a position analogous in some respects to that of Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress' in modern times, and critics have frequently compared the two works."

"The early writers are of opinion that it was really inspired. Irenæus quotes it as Scripture; Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of it as making its statements 'divinely;' and Origen, though a few of his expressions are regarded by some as implying doubt, unquestionably gives it as his opinion that it is 'divinely inspired.' Eusebius mentions that difference of opinion prevailed in his day as to the inspiration of the book, some opposing its claims, and others maintaining its divine origin, especially because it formed an admirable introduction to the Christian faith. For this latter reason it was read publicly, he tells us, in the churches."

With this introduction, we will proceed to the book itself. It opens thus:—

"He who had brought me up, sold me to one Rhode in Rome. Many years after this I recognized her, and I began to love her as a sister. Some time after, I saw her bathe in the River Tiber; and I gave her my hand, and drew her out of the river. The sight of her beauty

made me think with myself, 'I should be a happy man if I could but get a wife as handsome and good as she is.' This was the only thought that passed through me: this and nothing more.—*Book 1, vision 1, chap. 1.*

Since in the next chapter but one the writer speaks of his sons, and quite frequently afterwards of his wife, we cannot feel that his first appearance to us is to his credit. The following will serve to show that the writer is justly called by Mosheim "a wild, disordered fanatic." It is from the first part of vision 3:—

"The vision which I saw, my brethren, was of the following nature. Having fasted frequently, and having prayed to the Lord that he would show me the revelation which he promised to show me through that old woman, the same night that old woman appeared to me, and said to me, 'Since you are so anxious and eager to know all things, go into the part of the country where you tarry; and about the fifth hour I shall appear unto you, and show you all that you ought to see.' I asked her, saying, 'Lady, into what part of the country am I to go?' And she said, 'Into any part you wish.' Then I chose a spot which was suitable, and retired. Before, however, I began to speak and to mention the place, she said to me, 'I will come where you wish.' Accordingly, I went to the country, and counted the hours, and reached the place where I had promised to meet her. And I see an ivory seat ready placed, and on it a linen cushion, and above the linen cushion was spread a covering of fine linen. Seeing these laid out, and yet no one in the place, I began to feel awe, and as it were a trembling seized hold of me, and my hair stood on end, and as it were a horror came upon me when I saw that I was all alone. But on coming back to myself and calling to mind the glory of God, I took courage, bent my knees, and again confessed my sins to God as I had done before. Whereupon the old woman approached, accompanied by six young men whom I had

also seen before; and she stood behind me, and listened to me, as I prayed and confessed my sins to the Lord. And touching me she said, 'Hermas, cease praying continually for your sins; pray for righteousness, that you may have a portion of it immediately in your house.' On this, she took me up by the hand, and brought me to the seat, and said to the young men, 'Go and build.' When the young men had gone and we were alone, she said to me, 'Sit here.' I say to her, 'Lady, permit my elders to be seated first.' 'Do what I bid you,' said she; 'sit down.' When I would have sat down on her right, she did not permit me, but with her hand beckoned to me to sit down on the left. While I was thinking about this, and feeling vexed that she did not let me sit on the right, she said, 'Are you vexed, Hermas?' The place to the right is for others who have already pleased God, and have suffered for his name's sake; and you have yet much to accomplish before you can sit with them."

Passing by a great deal of nonsense, for the book contains little else, we come to the seventh chapter of vision 3, where we find the following bit of teaching concerning purgatory:—

"She finished her exposition of the tower. But I, shameless as I yet was, asked her, 'Is repentance possible for all those stones which have been cast away and did not fit into the building of the tower, and will they yet have a place in this tower?' 'Repentance,' said she, 'is yet possible, but in this tower they cannot find a suitable place. But in another and much inferior place they will be laid, and that, too, only when they have been tortured and completed the days of their sins. And on this account will they be transferred, because they have partaken of the righteous Word. And then only will they be removed from their punishments when the thought of repenting of the evil deeds which they have done has come into their hearts. But if it does not come into their hearts, they will not be saved, on account of the hardness of their heart.'"

Thus was the pagan notion of purgatory early introduced into the church.

In book 2, commandment 3, this teacher, whose writings were read in the churches, and were considered inspired, represents himself as weeping because he had all his life been guilty of falsehoods, and the angel gives him the wonderful assurance that if he keeps the words of truth which he hears, "even the falsehoods which you formerly told in your transactions may come to be believed through the truthfulness of your present statements."

In book 3, similitude 5, chapter 2, he is told a story of a man who planted a portion of a field to vines, and left one of his slaves to stake it, and to do nothing else while the master was gone. The slave was to receive his freedom if he did as he was commanded. But after the slave had done what the master had left for him to do, he cleared the vineyard of weeds, and, digging up the remaining portion of the field, he planted that to vines also. When the master returned, he made the slave his heir, for having done so much more than he was commanded to do. This parable is explained as follows in the next chapter:—

"If you do any good beyond what is commanded by God, you will gain for yourself more abundant glory, and will be more honored by God than you would otherwise be. If, therefore, in keeping the commandments of God, you do, in addition, these services, you will have joy if you observe them according to my command."

Bishop Coxe, who is the especial apologist for Hermas, says that "to read into this passage the idea of supererogatory merit is an unpardonable anachronism." That

is, he claims that this passage cannot teach supererogatory merit, because no such doctrine was held at that time! But we may not reason in that way. We can determine what doctrines men believed at that time only by what they taught. The statement that men did not hold that doctrine at that early date, is overthrown by this passage, where it is clearly taught; for the unprejudiced reader will see in it the Catholic dogma that men may be better than the Lord requires them to be. This is the foundation of the antichristian doctrine of indulgences for sin. It is not at all surprising to find this doctrine taught by a semi-heathen writer even in the second century, for it is perfectly in keeping with heathen conceit.

The effect of the following childish, silly, and wicked passage upon those who regarded the writings of Hermas as inspired, can be better imagined than described. When we come to consider the great apostasy, we shall see that the reading of such stuff in the church bore its legitimate fruit:—

"Having spoken these words he wished to depart; but I laid hold of him by the wallet, and began to adjure him by the Lord that he would explain what he had showed me. He said to me, 'I must rest a little, and then I shall explain to you everything; wait for me here until I return.' I said to him, 'Sir, what can I do here alone?' 'You are not alone,' he said, 'for these virgins are with you.' 'Give me in charge to them, then,' I replied. The Shepherd called them to him, and said to them, 'I intrust him to you until I come,' and went away. And I was alone with the virgins; and they were rather merry, but were friendly to me, especially the four more distinguished of them.

"The virgins said to me, 'The Shepherd does not come here to-day.' 'What, then,' said I, 'am I to do?' They

replied, 'Wait for him until he comes; and if he comes he will converse with you, and if he does not come you will remain here with us until he does come.' I said to them, 'I will wait for him until it is late; and if he does not arrive, I will go away into the house, and come back early in the morning.' And they answered and said to me, 'You were intrusted to us; you cannot go away from us.' 'Where, then,' I said, 'am I to remain?' 'You will sleep with us,' they replied, 'as a brother, and not as a husband: for you are our brother, and for the time to come we intend to abide with you, for we love you exceedingly!' But I was ashamed to remain with them. And she who seemed to be the first among them began to kiss me. (And the others seeing her kissing me, began also to kiss me), and to lead me round the tower, and to play with me. And I, too, became like a young man, and began to play with them: for some of them formed a chorus, and others danced, and others sang; and I, keeping silence, walked with them around the tower, and was merry with them. And when it grew late I wished to go into the house; and they would not let me, but detained me. So I remained with them during the night, and slept beside the tower. Now the virgins spread their linen tunics on the ground, and made me lie down in the midst of them; and they did nothing at all but pray; and I without ceasing prayed with them, and not less than they. And the virgins rejoiced because I thus prayed. And I remained there with the virgins until the next day at the second hour. Then the Shepherd returned, and said to the virgins, 'Did you offer him any insult?' 'Ask him,' they said. I said to him, 'Sir, I was delighted that I remained with them.'"—*Book 3, similitude 9, chap. 10, 11.*

Our reason for placing this matter before the reader is that he may judge for himself of the character of the early writings which are lauded so highly, and that he may see the stuff upon which the early churches were

fed. The translator says of the book that it "is very important in many respects; but especially as reflecting the tone and style of books which interested and instructed the Christians of the second and third centuries." And it is to churches which were interested and instructed by such stuff, that we are urged to look for an example of Christian faith and practice. We are told that the Sunday sabbath is worthy of regard because it originated in the early history of the church; but when we read that the "Pastor of Hermas" was "one of the most popular books, if not the most popular book, in the Christian church during the second, third, and fourth centuries," and that "the early writers are of opinion that it was really inspired," we prefer to go elsewhere for a model. And we can feel only pity for the blindness of a man who in this age will defend such a work, as does Bishop Coxe, by saying, "Blessed were the simple folk . . . . who eagerly drank in the pure and searching morality of the 'Shepherd.'" Pure and searching morality indeed! How vicious would their teaching have to be before he would call it immoral?

In speaking thus of the churches in the second, third, and fourth centuries, the writer would not be understood as holding that there was then no pure and undefiled religion. There were as pure Christians then as there have ever been before or since; but they did not constitute the bulk of the churches. They were the few among whom *the Bible* was the most popular book, and who followed its clear light instead of the darkness of nominally converted heathen philosophers, or of "wild, disordered fanatics." If the reader wishes to know the customs of these real Christians, he will find them clearly set forth in the

teachings of Christ and the apostles, as found in the Bible, which is the only guide for the Christians of every age.

THE "EPISTLE OF CLEMENT."

There are two epistles and several other productions attributed to Clement of Rome, but as the first epistle is the only one that is by anyone regarded as genuine, it is the only one that we need to notice. This epistle opens thus: "The church of God which sojourns at Rome, to the church of God sojourning at Corinth." This is the only signature it has; but in the catalogue of contents prefixed to the manuscript, the authorship is attributed to one Clement. All that is known of him is that he is *supposed* to have been the one whom the Catholics claim as the third (by some the fifth) pope of Rome. It is therefore *supposed* that this epistle was written about the close of the first century of the Christian era. Following is what Mosheim has to say of this matter: —

"Next after the apostles, Clement, the bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation as one of the writers of this century. The accounts we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are, for the most part, uncertain. There are still extant, two epistles to the Corinthians bearing his name, written in Greek; of these, it is generally supposed that the first is genuine, and that the second is falsely palmed upon the holy man by some deceiver. Yet even the first epistle seems to have been corrupted by some indiscreet person, who was sorry to see no more marks of erudition and genius in a production of so great a man.

"The other works which bear the name of Clement, namely, the 'Apostolic Canons,' the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' the 'Recognitions of Clement,' and the 'Clementina,' were fraudulently ascribed to this eminent Father, by

some deceiver, for the purpose of procuring them greater authority. This, all now concede. . . . The eight books of 'Apostolical Constitutions' are the work of some austere and melancholy author, who designed to reform the worship and discipline of the church, which he thought were fallen from their original purity and sanctity, and who ventured to prefix the names of the apostles to his precepts and regulations, in order to give them currency. The 'Recognitions of Clement,' which differ but little from the 'Clementina,' are ingenious and pretty fables."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 18, 19.*

Neander says:—

"After Barnabas, we come to Clement, perhaps the same whom Paul mentions (Phil. 4:3); he was at the end of the first century bishop of Rome. Under his name we have one epistle to the church of Corinth, and the fragment of another. The first was read in the first centuries aloud at divine service in many churches, even with the writings of the New Testament; it contains an exhortation to unity, interwoven with examples and general reflections, addressed to the church at Corinth, which was shaken by divisions. This letter, although, on the whole, genuine, is, nevertheless, not free from important interpolations."—*P. 408.*

The object in making this quotation is to show how highly the epistle was regarded. There is really nothing striking in the epistle; but when men depart from the light of God's word, they are in a condition to accept of the most puerile stuff. We make only one extract from this epistle, namely, Clement's proof of the resurrection:—

"Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord continually proves to us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has rendered the Lord Jesus Christ the first-fruits by raising him from the dead. Let us contemplate, beloved, the resurrection which is at all times tak-

ing place. Day and night declare to us a resurrection. The night sinks to sleep, and the day arises; the day (again) departs, and the night comes on. Let us behold the fruits (of the earth), how the sowing of grain takes place. The sower goes forth, and casts it into the ground; and the seed being thus scattered, though dry and naked when it fell upon the earth, is gradually dissolved. Then out of its dissolution the mighty power of the providence of the Lord raises it up again, and from one seed many arise and bring forth fruit.

"Let us consider that wonderful sign (of the resurrection) which takes place in Eastern lands, that is, in Arabia and the countries round about. There is a certain bird which is called a phœnix. This is the only one of its kind, and lives five hundred years. And when the time of its dissolution draws near that it must die, it builds itself a nest of frankincense, and myrrh, and other spices, into which, when the time is fulfilled, it enters and dies. But as the flesh decays, a certain kind of worm is produced, which, being nourished by the juices of the dead bird, brings forth feathers. Then, when it has acquired strength, it takes up that nest in which are the bones of its parent, and bearing these it passes from the land of Arabia into Egypt, to the city called Heliopolis. And, in open day, flying in the sight of all men, it places them on the altar of the sun, and having done this, hastens back to its former abode. The priests then inspect the registers of the dates, and find that it has returned exactly as the five hundredth year was completed.

"Do we then deem it any great and wonderful thing for the Maker of all things to raise up again those that have piously served him in the assurance of a good faith, when even by a bird he shows us the mightiness of his power to fulfill his promise?"—*Epistle 1, chap. 24, 25, and 26.*

Every Bible student knows that both the Old Testa-

ment and also the New, abound in references to the resurrection. With the apostle Paul, especially, it is a prominent theme. Now we ask if it is at all probable that any man who was familiar with the Bible would pass by its wealth of testimony on the subject of the resurrection, and produce as proof of it only a ridiculous fable? Whether this epistle was written by Clement, or by somebody who lived later and who forged his name, one thing is certain, and that is, that as a book of Christian doctrine it is not worth the paper on which it is written. We are totally at a loss to understand the reverence with which so many people regard this stuff. But we would especially ask the reader to form in his mind a picture of the condition of churches that took it down week after week as inspired teaching. The inevitable result of feeding upon such vapid stuff, must have been mental degeneration, and an inability to distinguish real argument from fancy.

CHAPTER VII.

THE "EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS."

BEFORE we make any statements or quotations concerning Ignatius or the epistles ascribed to him, we will give the only passage in the epistles which is supposed to teach the observance of Sunday. It is the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Magnesians, and, as translated, reads as follows:—

"If, therefore, those who were brought up in the ancient order of things have come to the possession of a new hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living in the observance of the Lord's day, on which also our life has sprung up again by him and by his death—whom some deny, by which mystery we have obtained faith, and therefore endure, that we may be found the disciples of Jesus Christ, our only Master—how shall we be able to live apart from him, whose disciples the prophets themselves in the Spirit did wait for him as their teacher? And therefore he whom they rightly waited for, being come, raised them from the dead."

The writer of the article, "The Lord's Day," in Kitto's "Encyclopedia of Religious Literature," after mentioning several alleged testimonies in favor of Sunday, says:—

"We must here notice one other passage of earlier date than any of these, which has often been referred to as bearing on the subject of the Lord's day, though it certainly *contains* no mention of it. It occurs in the epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians (about A. D. 100). The whole passage is confessedly obscure, and the text may be corrupt. . . . The passage is as follows:—

"*Εἰ οὖν οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες, εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες· (ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου*, etc.

"Now many commentators assume (on what ground does not appear) that after *κυριακὴν* the word *ἡμέραν* is to be understood. On this hypothesis they endeavor to make the rest of the sentence accord with a reference to the observance of the Lord's day, by further supposing *ἐν ᾗ* to refer to *ἡμέρα* understood, and the whole to be put in contrast with *σαββατίζοντες* in the former clause."

"Let us now look at the passage simply as it stands. The defect of the sentence is the want of a substantive to which *αὐτοῦ* can refer. This defect, so far from being remedied, is rendered still more glaring by the introduction of *ἡμέρα*. Now if we take *κυριακὴ ζωή* as simply 'the life of the Lord,' having a more personal meaning, it certainly goes nearer to supplying the substantive to *αὐτοῦ*. Again, *ἐν ᾗ* may well refer to *ζωή*, and *κυριακὴ ζωή* meaning our Lord's *life*, as emphatically including his resurrection (as in Rom. 5:10, etc.), presents precisely the same analogy to the spiritual life of the Christian as is conveyed both in Rom. 5, Col. 3:3, 4, and many other passages. Thus upon the whole the meaning might be given thus:—

"'If those who lived under the old dispensation have come to the newness of hope, no longer keeping sabbaths, but living according to our Lord's life (in which, as it were, our life has risen again, through him, and his death which some deny), . . . how shall we be able to live without him?' . . .

"In this way (allowing for the involved style of the whole) the meaning seems to us simple, consistent, and grammatical, without any gratuitous introduction of words understood; and this view has been followed by many, though it is a subject on which considerable controversy has existed. On this view the passage does not

refer at all to the Lord's day; but even on the opposite supposition it cannot be regarded as affording any positive evidence to the early use of the term 'Lord's day' (for which it is often cited), since the material word ἡμέρα is purely conjectural."—*Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature, art. Lord's Day.*

Thus we have the testimony of an unprejudiced witness, a scholar and critic, and an observer of the first day of the week, to the effect that the oft-quoted passage from Ignatius makes no reference whatever to the first day of the week, sometimes erroneously called "Lord's day." But whether it does or not is a matter of very little importance, as we shall see when we have examined all the witnesses in the case. We have given this extract that the reader may see that, however the epistle be regarded, it affords no aid or comfort to the adherents of Sunday, since it makes no allusion whatever to the day. But the candid man who knows the truth about the writings of Ignatius would not consider the Sunday cause strengthened in the least, even if they contained the most explicit and unequivocal reference to it. We shall now proceed to learn what we can of Ignatius and his epistles.

The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says:—

"The information we get in regard to Ignatius, up to the time of Eusebius, is exceedingly scanty."

"McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia" says:—

"We have no trustworthy accounts of the life and ministry of Ignatius. The chief authority is the '*Martyrium Ignatii*,' but even those who assert the genuineness of that work admit that it is greatly interpolated."

Uhlhorn, in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," says:—

"The only sources from which any information can be drawn about this celebrated person are the epistles circulating under his name. Eusebius knows nothing more of him than what can be extracted from the epistles, with the exception of a few short notices by Irenæus and by Origen, which he also knows. But the list which he gives of the bishops of Antioch is doubtful with respect to its chronology. . . . What tradition else has preserved concerning Ignatius—the story that he was the child spoken of in Matt. 18:5, and other fictions by Simeon Metaphrastes and Vincentius—is completely worthless. Nor are the various '*Acta Martyrii*' of any historical value. We have two which are completely independent of each other. . . . But all these '*Acta Martyrii*' are spurious; they contradict the epistles; they swarm with unhistorical statements; they were not known to any old writer, not even to Eusebius; they date, probably, from the fifth century. Thus the epistles are the only source of information left to us. They claim to have been written by Ignatius, on his journey from Antioch (where he had been condemned to death) to Rome, where he was to suffer the punishment of being torn to pieces by wild beasts."

And the "Encyclopedia Britannica" says still further:—

"The letters of Ignatius cause great difficulty to the critic."

From the above, then, it would seem as if not very much would be known with certainty, since we get all our information from the epistles, and the epistles themselves are of somewhat doubtful authority. But let us hear more concerning them. In the introductory notice to the epistles, we find the following statements by the translator:—

"There are, in all, fifteen epistles which bear the name of Ignatius. These are the following: One to the virgin

Mary, two to the apostle John, one to Mary of Cassobelæ, one to the Tarsians, one to the Antiochians, one to Hero, a deacon of Antioch, one to the Philippians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrnæans, and one to Polycarp. The first three exist only in Latin; all the rest are extant also in Greek.

"It is now the universal opinion of critics, that the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which were at various dates, and to serve special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated bishop of Antioch.

"But after the question has been thus simplified, it still remains sufficiently complex. Of the seven epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3:36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer. It is plain that one or the other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and scholars have for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing the genuine letters of Ignatius."

"But although the shorter form of the Ignatian letters had been generally accepted in preference to the longer, there was still a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars, that even it could not be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity. Thus said Lardner, in his 'Credibility of the Gospel History' (1743): 'I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the larger are an interpolation of the smaller, and not the smaller an epitome or abridgment of the larger. . . . But whether the smaller themselves are the genuine writings of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens

of the ablest critics. And whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question.'"

Dr. Killen thus briefly and clearly sets forth the history of the Ignatian epistles:—

"The history of the Ignatian epistles may well remind us of the story of the Sibylline books. A female in strange attire is said to have appeared before Tarquin of Rome, offering to sell nine manuscripts which she had in her possession; but the king, discouraged by the price, declined the application. The woman withdrew; destroyed the one-third of her literary treasures; and, returning again into the royal presence, demanded the same price for what were left. The monarch once more refused to come up to her terms; and the mysterious visitor retired again, and burnt the one-half of her remaining store. Her extraordinary conduct excited much astonishment; and, on consulting with his augurs, Tarquin was informed that the documents which she had at her disposal were most valuable, and that he should by all means endeavor to secure such a prize. The king now willingly paid for the three books, not yet committed to the flames, the full price originally demanded for all the manuscripts. The Ignatian epistles have experienced something like the fate of those Sibylline oracles. In the sixteenth century, fifteen letters were brought out from beneath the mantle of a hoary antiquity, and offered to the world as the productions of the pastor of Antioch. Scholars refused to receive them on the terms required, and forthwith eight of them were admitted to be forgeries. In the seventeenth century, the seven remaining letters, in a somewhat altered form, again came forth from obscurity, and claimed to be the works of Ignatius. Again, discerning critics refused to acknowledge their pretensions; but curiosity was roused by this second apparition, and many expressed an earnest desire to obtain a sight of the real epistles. Greece, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt

were ransacked in search of them, and at length three letters are found. The discovery creates general gratulation; it is confessed that four of the epistles, so lately asserted to be genuine, are apocryphal; and it is boldly said that the three now forthcoming are above challenge. But truth still refuses to be compromised, and sternly disowns these claimants for her approbation. The internal evidence of these three epistles abundantly attests that, like the last three books of the Sibyl, they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture.

"The candid investigator, who compares the Curetonian version of the letters with that previously in circulation, must acknowledge that Ignatius, in his new dress, has lost nothing of his absurdity and extravagance. The passages of the epistles, which were formerly felt to be so objectionable, are yet to be found here in all their unmitigated folly. Ignatius is still the same anti-evangelical formalist, the same puerile boaster, the same dreaming mystic, and the same crazy fanatic. These are weighty charges, and yet they can be substantiated."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 3, paragraphs 1, 2.*

Some may shake their heads at this last paragraph, and say that they cannot believe that Ignatius was such a man; they have the idea firmly fixed in their minds that Ignatius was a wise bishop and a holy man, and they cannot give it up. Nor need they. Dr. Killen makes no charge against Ignatius himself, but against the Ignatius who is made to appear in the epistles which are ascribed to him.

Let us get this matter clearly in our minds. But little is known of Ignatius except what is learned from these epistles, and it is charged that these epistles are spurious. How, then, it may be asked, do we know that such a person existed? 1. There is slight reference made to him in one or two other documents. 2. If there had not

been such a person, it is not probable that letters would have been put forth bearing his name. The Catholic Church has never hesitated to manufacture history or doctrine when it could not find what it wanted already written. These documents have always been given the name of some person of good repute, and they served the purpose of the church as well as if they were genuine. Now when we remember that this same "mystery of iniquity" was working even as far back as the days of Paul, we need not be surprised that, less than a century later, writings already in existence were garbled, and that designing persons wrote epistles and signed the names of eminent men to them, in order to give them currency.—Indeed, we find that this very thing was done in the days of Paul, and that his own name was used to give currency to false doctrine. In 2 Thess. 2:1–3 we read his own words: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, *nor by letter as from us*, as that the day of Christ is at hand. *Let no man deceive you* by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed," etc.

Here we find that the Thessalonians had received letters purporting to come from Paul, which declared that the coming of Christ was imminent. This was contrary to his first epistle, and he himself, after telling what should take place before the coming of the Lord, says: "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" 2 Thess. 2:5. Yet, notwithstanding the instruction which Paul had given them, these letters

came so seemingly direct from Paul, that the Thessalonians were greatly disturbed. Paul cautions them against being deceived, and in closing this epistle, he gives them to understand how they may know that an epistle purporting to come from him is genuine. When he comes to the close, he says: "The salutation of Paul *with mine own hand*, which is the token in every epistle; so I write: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." 2 Thess. 3:17, 18. From this we learn that although Paul usually (probably *always*, with the exception of the epistle to the Galatians, see Gal. 6:11) employed an amanuensis, he always wrote the benediction and signed his name with his own hand, so that none need be deceived. Any letter bearing a signature other than his might be known to be spurious.

Therefore while we may believe that such a man as Ignatius lived, and that he suffered martyrdom for his faith, we need not believe that he wrote the egotistical trash that is attributed to him. Indeed, we *cannot* believe that he wrote it, if we regard him as a holy man.

We now proceed with the testimony. In the preface to his "Ancient Church," Dr. Killen says of the Ignatian epistles:—

"If we accredit these documents, the history of the early church is thrown into a state of hopeless confusion; and men, taught and honored by the apostles themselves, must have inculcated the most dangerous errors. But if their claims vanish, when touched by the wand of truthful criticism, many clouds which have hitherto darkened the ecclesiastical atmosphere disappear; and the progress of corruption can be traced on scientific principles. The special attention of all interested in the Ignatian controversy is invited to the two chapters of this work in which

the subject is investigated. Evidence is there produced to prove that these Ignatian letters, even as edited by the very learned and laborious Doctor Cureton, are utterly spurious, and that they should be swept away from among the genuine remains of early church literature with the besom of scorn."

Mosheim says:—

"There are extant several epistles with the name of Ignatius prefixed to them; but a question having been made as to their authenticity, a deal of learned and elaborate discussion has taken place on the subject amongst men of erudition, and the point has been contested by them with considerable vehemence; some asserting them to be spurious, others insisting on it that they are genuine. The most prevailing opinion appears to be that the seven which are reputed to have been written by him in the course of his journey to Rome, namely those respectively addressed to the Smyrnæans, to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Philadelphians, and to the Trallians, as they stand in the edition of them published in the seventeenth century, from a manuscript in the Medicean library at Florence, are unquestionably genuine, though there are not wanting those who, on account of its dissimilitude of style, consider the authenticity of the epistle to Polycarp as less to be depended on than that of the other six. As for the rest of these epistles, of which no mention whatever is made by any of the early Christian writers, they are commonly rejected as altogether spurious. The distinction thus generally recognized in favor of the above-mentioned particular letters is grounded on reasons of no little force and weight, but at the same time they are not of such a conclusive nature as to silence all objection; on the contrary, a regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged, that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole, of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it altogether a case of much intricacy and doubt." —*Ecclesiastical Commentaries, cent. 1, sec. 52.*

Neander says of the so-called "Epistles of Ignatius:" "Even the shorter and more trustworthy edition is very much interpolated."

Dr. Schaff (History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, sec. 119) says:—

"The doctrinal and churchly views of the Ignatian epistles are framed on a peculiar combination and somewhat materialistic apprehension of John's doctrine of the incarnation, and Paul's idea of the church as the body of Jesus Christ. In the 'Catholic Church'—an expression introduced by him—that is, the Episcopal orthodox organization of his day, the author sees, as it were, the continuation of the mystery of the incarnation, on the reality of which he laid great emphasis against the docetists; and in every bishop, a visible representative of Christ, and a personal center of ecclesiastical unity, which he presses home upon his readers with the greatest solicitude and almost passionate zeal. He thus applies those ideas of the apostles directly to the outward constitution, and makes them subservient to the principle and institution of the growing hierarchy. Here lies the chief importance of these epistles; and in this respect we have found it necessary to distinguish them already in the section on the organization of the church.

"It is remarkable that the idea of the episcopal hierarchy should be first clearly and boldly brought out, not by the contemporary Roman bishop, Clement, but by a bishop of the Eastern church; though it was transplanted by him to the soil of Rome, and there sealed with his martyr blood. Equally noticeable is the circumstance, that these oldest documents of the hierarchy soon became so interpolated, curtailed, and mutilated by pious fraud, that it is to-day almost impossible to discover with certainty the genuine Ignatius of history under the hyper and pseudo-Ignatius of tradition."

And Dr. Killen closes up his remarks on this subject as follows:—

"It is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin, that, upwards of three hundred years ago, he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time, many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat precipitate in pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself. . . . Calvin knew that an apostolic man must have been acquainted with apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the productions of an age when the pure light of Christianity was greatly obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it. 'There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of Ignatius.'"—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 3, paragraph 12.*

After these strong statements, the reader will doubtless have some curiosity to read a little of this "trash." Accordingly, we give a few extracts from it. In the epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 1, we find the following:—

"On hearing that I came bound from Syria for the common name and hope, trusting through your prayers to be permitted to fight with beasts at Rome, that so by martyrdom I may indeed become the disciple of him 'who gave himself for us, an offering and sacrifice to God' (ye hastened to see me)."

The writer seems to have an idea that only by martyr-

dom could he be a true disciple of the Lord, and he manifests an unseemly haste for it, which we are sure would not be the case with a holy man who was really expecting martyrdom. On this point we quote again:—

"For it is not my desire to act towards you as a man-pleaser, but as pleasing God, even as also ye please him. For neither shall I ever have such (another) opportunity of attaining to God; nor will ye, if ye shall now be silent, ever be entitled to the honor of a better work. For if ye are silent concerning me, I shall become God's; but if you show your love to my flesh, I shall again have to run my race. Pray, then, do not seek to confer any greater favor upon me than that I be sacrificed to God while the altar is still prepared; that, being gathered together in love, ye may sing praise to the Father, through Christ Jesus, that God has deemed me, the bishop of Syria, worthy to be sent for from the East unto the West. It is good to set from the world unto God, that I may rise again to him."—*Epistle to the Romans, chap. 2.*

In the following paragraphs he again expresses his ardent desire to be eaten up:—

"I write to the churches, and impress on them all, that I shall willingly die for God, unless ye hinder me. I beseech of you not to show an unseasonable good-will toward me. Suffer me to become food for the wild beasts, through whose instrumentality it will be granted me to attain to God. I am the wheat of God, and let me be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather entice the wild beasts, that they may become my tomb, and may leave nothing of my body; so that when I have fallen asleep (in death), I may be no trouble to anyone. Then shall I truly be a disciple of Christ, when the world shall not see so much as my body. Entreat Christ for me, that by these instruments I may be found a sacrifice (to God)."

"May I enjoy the wild beasts that are prepared for me; and I pray they may be found eager to rush upon me, which also I will entice to devour me speedily, and not deal with me as with some, whom, out of fear, they have not touched. But if they be unwilling to assail me, I will compel them to do so. Pardon me (in this): I know what is for my benefit. Now I begin to be a disciple."—*Epistle to the Romans, chap. 4, 5.*

There are many passages similar to the above. They prove, what we shall later on find from the most unexceptionable testimony is the case, that the idea very early began to prevail that a martyr was more sure of gaining Heaven than one who simply lived a good life, and died a natural death. The idea was that whatever sins the individual had upon him were washed away by the shedding of his own blood. As a consequence many fanatical people eagerly sought martyrdom, and it came to be considered as almost a mortal sin to flee in time of persecution. The idea that the martyrs were cleansed from sin by their own blood finds its modern counterpart in the famous "blood atonement" among the Mormons. It is unnecessary to do more than remind the reader of the limited views of the atonement of Christ, which must have been held by such people.

That the "Epistles of Ignatius" were written by someone who was anxious that the bishops should have a chance to lord it over God's heritage, is evident from the following extracts:—

"Wherefore it is fitting that ye should run together in accordance with the will of your bishop, which things also ye do."

"Let us be careful, then, not to set ourselves in opposition to the bishop, in order that we may be subject to God."

"It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself."—*Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. 4, 5, 6.*

"It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honors the bishop has been honored of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does (in reality) serve the devil."—*Epistle to the Smyrnæans, chap. 9.*

"But it becomes both men and women who marry, to form their union with the approval of the bishop, that their marriage may be according to God, and not after their own lust."

"Give ye heed to the bishop, that God also may give heed to you. My soul be for theirs that are submissive to the bishop, to the presbyters, and to the deacons, and may my portion be along with them in God!"—*Epistle to Polycarp, chap. 5, 6.*

The following "great mystery" which this pseudo-Ignatius reveals, shows that the writer was a fit companion for Hermas and the pseudo-Barnabas:—

"Now the virginity of Mary was hidden from the prince of this world, as was also her offspring, and the death of the Lord; three mysteries of renown, which were wrought in silence by God. How, then, was he manifested to the world? A star shone forth in heaven above all the other stars, the light of which was inexpressible, while its novelty struck men with astonishment. And all the rest of the stars, with the sun and moon, formed a chorus to this star, and its light was exceedingly great above them all. And there was agitation felt as to whence this new spectacle came, so unlike to everything else (in the heavens). Hence every kind of magic was destroyed, and every bond of wickedness disappeared; ignorance was removed, and the old kingdom abolished, God himself being manifested in human form for the renewal of eternal life. And now that took a beginning which had been prepared by God. Henceforth all things

were in a state of tumult, because he meditated the abolition of death."—*Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. 19.*

And, lastly, we quote the following jargon as evidence of the senseless egotism of the one who wrote this "trash:"—

"Am I not able to write to you of heavenly things? But I fear to do so, lest I should inflict injury on you who are but babes (in Christ). Pardon me in this respect, lest, as not being able to receive (such doctrines), ye should be strangled by them. For even I, though I am bound (for Christ), yet am not on that account able to understand heavenly things, and the places of the angels, and their gatherings under their respective princes, things visible and invisible. Without reference to such abstruse subjects, I am still but a learner (in other respects); for many things are wanting to us, that we come not short of God."—*Epistle to the Trallians, chap 5.*

If this were the age when insane persons were regarded as sacred beings, and as being possessed of divine inspiration, we should not wonder at the great esteem with which this stuff is held by many people; but as it is, there is a mystery about it. When people who have access to the works of the world's master-minds, to say nothing of the sublime truths of the Bible, spend their precious time studying the writings of the so-called Fathers, it seems as though they must be possessed of something akin to that mental and moral depravity which leads the school-boy to devour the dime novel.

CHAPTER VIII.

"THE TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES."

ALL that is known of this document may be given in brief as follows: In 1873 Philotheos Bryennios, at that time head master of the higher Greek school at Constantinople, but now metropolitan at Nicomedia, discovered a collection of manuscripts in the library of the "Jerusalem Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulcher" at Constantinople. The collection was bound in one volume, and was all written by the same hand. It bore the significant signature, "Leon, notary and sinner," and the Greek date 6564, which equals A. D. 1056. The manuscripts that formed the remainder of the collection, are the following:—

"Synopsis of the Old and New Testaments," by St. Chrysostom; "The Epistle of Barnabas;" "The Two Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians;" "The Epistle of Mary of Cassoboli to Ignatius;" "Twelve Epistles of Ignatius."

The matter was translated into German, and published February 3, 1884; and was translated from the German into English, and published in America, February 28, 1884. Archdeacon Farrar published in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1884, a version from the Greek.

These are the simple facts concerning the discovery and publication of the "Teaching," as given in the introductory notice to the edition published by the Christian Literature Company. The excitement which its first appearance caused in the religious world was intense,

equal at least to that which would be produced in the Catholic Church by the discovery of one of the bones of an apostle. The New York *Independent* said that it was "by all odds the most important writing, exterior to the New Testament, now in the possession of the Christian world;" and some other journals seemed to regard it as fully equal to the New Testament. One thing is certain, and that is that for a few months after the publication of the "Teaching," they devoted more space and attention to it than to the Bible.

Of course no one supposes that the apostles themselves ever saw or heard of the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles." Says Professor Riddle, in his introductory notice: "Of apostolic origin no one should presume to speak, since the text of the document makes no such claim, and internal evidence is obviously against any such suggestion." As to when it was written, nobody knows, and there is no means of knowing. Some *guess* that it was written as early as A. D. 80, while others, with far more reason, place it much later, at dates varying from 120 to 190 A. D. Concerning the character of the work, Bishop Coxe, in his prefatory note, says:—

"Lactantius, in his 'Institutes,' shapes his instructions to Constantine by the *Duæ viæ*, which seem to have been formulated in the earliest ages for the training of catechumens. The elementary nature and the 'childishness' of the work are thus accounted for, and I am sure that the 'mystagogic' teaching of Cyril receives light from this view of the matter. This work was 'food for lambs;' it was not meant to meet the wants of those 'of full age.' It may prove, as Dr. Riddle hints, that the teaching as we have it, in the Bryennios document, is tainted by the views of some nascent sect or heresy, or by the incompetency of some obscure local church as yet unvisited by

learned teachers and evangelists. It seems to me not improbably influenced by views of the *charismata*, which ripened into Montanism, and which are illustrated by the warnings and admonitions of Hermas."

The question which would naturally arise is, Why should we take this document as an exponent of the belief and teaching of the apostles, rather than the genuine writings of the apostles? The only possible answer is, We should not. If we wish to become acquainted with the teachings and belief of John Wesley, we go to his own published works, and not to what some anonymous writer may have said of him. So with the apostles. The New Testament, and that alone, contains their doctrine, and upon that alone we must depend for our knowledge of what they taught. Anything else purporting to come from them is a base forgery.

We should not omit to state that that which recommended the "Teaching" to the religious world, as something of great value, was the fact that it was discovered in company with the "Epistle of Barnabas," and twelve of the "Epistles of Ignatius." That might be a good recommendation to some, but to one who has learned the simple truth concerning those productions, it will be almost sufficient ground on which to condemn the whole thing. To be found in such company is *prima facie* evidence of bad character.

There is no more thorough student, and none better acquainted with Patristic literature, than Professor Harnack, of Berlin. It was he who first called the attention of the western theological world to the discovery of Bryennios, and he has carefully examined everything of importance that has been said about that document.

In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, of June 12, 1886, he published the first of a series of articles on the character and result of the discussions that have been published on the "Teaching," and from that article the New York *Independent*, of August 26, 1886, made a lengthy extract, the greater part of which we reproduce. It puts together, without comment, the conflicting opinions that are held in regard to it. Says Harnack:—

"One investigator puts the newly discovered writing before the Pauline letters, or even before the Council of the Apostles (Sabatier); the second, in the name of Paul; the third, soon after the destruction of Jerusalem (Bestinann); the fourth, in the last decades of the first century (an idea that finds very much favor); the fifth, in the days of Trajan (also a favorite idea); the sixth, in the days of Bar-cochba; the seventh, in the time of Antonines; the eighth, about the time of Commodus; the ninth, in the third century; the tenth, in the fourth century; and there are some who favor the fifth or a later century. So much in reference to the time of composition.

"In other points matters stand no better. On the history of its transmission, one says that it is the book known to the Fathers from the days of Clement; others deny this; a third party seeks a middle path.

"In regard to the integrity of the book, some say the book is from one author, and original; others that it is a compilation, and is crowded with interpolations; that it consists of two or more parts that originally did not belong together. In regard to the character of the book, some claim that it is well arranged, others that it is poorly arranged; some that in parts it is well arranged, and in parts poorly arranged; some that the skill of the author must be admired; others that the author has no idea of the literary arts.

"With regard to the sources, some say that only the Old Testament served as a source, and that all the rest is original, because older than all other Christian writ-

ings; others say that there is nothing original in the book, but the whole is taken from other sources; some that the New Testament receives no witness from the 'Didache;' others that nearly all the New Testament books are used in it, and that the book itself thereby seems the best proof of its antiquity; some that Barnabas and Hermas are used; others that Barnabas is used, but that Hermas in turn used the 'Didache;' others, on the other hand, that Hermas was used, and that Barnabas is a later production; others that Philo, the Sibylline books, and the Gentile moralists were used; others that in primitive apostolic simplicity the author has reproduced only the pure gospel.

"In regard to the standpoint of the author, some claim that it is primitive apostolic from the view of the Jewish-Christians; others that it is a post-apostolic and Jewish-Christian; others, anti-Pauline; others, that it is strongly influenced by Paul; others, that it is Saddusaic; others, vulgar, heathenish; others, dangerously Ebionitic; others, Marcionitic; others, Montanistic; others, Theodotian; others, quite moralizing; others, encratistic; others, thoroughly Byzantine, but under a transparent mask; others, that the standpoint cannot be discovered, since the author has not treated of his 'faith;' others, classically evangelical.

"With regard to the importance of the book, some say that it is the most important discovery of the century, and should be received into the canon of the New Testament; that it is the whole Bible *in nuce;* that it solves the greatest problems; that it is peculiar, and should be used with care; that it shows the average Christianity; that as a compilation it cannot be used in picturing any period; that it shows poverty of contents; the Christianity of the author can only be lamented; that it is rationalistic, barren, and flat, but nevertheless interesting; that it is a miserable production, without any importance for those or our times; the book is characteristic only of the Byzantine forger. Places assigned for the writing: Egypt, Greece, Syria, Jerusalem, Rome, Asia Minor, Constantinople. . . .

"Then some regard it as setting forth the Apostolic, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal, or no system of church government whatever. It is considered of great value because it favors the Protestant, or the Catholic, or the Baptist, or the anti-Baptist, or the Chiliastic, or the anti-Chiliastic, or the Irvingian, or some other church party; because it is still Apostolic and anti-Catholic, and at the same time Catholic; because its prophets are still apostles of the real primitive Christianity; others, then, claim that they are new prophets, or no prophets at all, but rather inventive swindlers and parasites; others that they are no swindlers, but *homunculi* produced by a forger."

As the showman said, "You pays your money, and you takes your choice." There are opinions enough here, from which one can choose. We see no reason for regarding it any more highly than the matter ascribed to Barnabas, Hermas, and Clement, or the "trash" attributed to Ignatius. That it contains some truth cannot be questioned, but there is none that is not contained in far better form in the New Testament, and so it is not worth while to try to winnow it out from the error. It cannot add anything to the light that shines from God's word; its only effect can be to obscure it.

But why was it that the "Teaching" was received with such enthusiasm? It was chiefly because there was one chapter in it which by judicious manipulation could be made to do service in the Sunday cause. The passage which was hailed with such joy was the fourteenth chapter, which, in the edition published by the Christian Literature Company, is translated as follows:—

"But every Lord's day do ye gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one that is at variance with his

fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord. In every place and time offer to me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great king, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations."

Now if this document is to be accepted as embodying the correct teaching of the apostles, it must be accepted as a whole. As soon as we discriminate against any portion as being incorrect, we throw discredit upon the whole. If the above reference is to be taken as proof that the apostles observed the first day of the week, and thus marked out our duty for us, it also proves just as conclusively that they partook of the communion every first day of the week, and that all Christians should do likewise. The fact that those who laud the "Teaching" the most highly do not follow its injunction in this respect is proof that they do not attach any real value to the document. They will follow it just so far as it seems to support their preconceived opinions; and they find it very convenient to have even a forgery to which to appeal in support of the practices which they are determined to follow.

But it will be noticed that the passage does not define the Lord's day, and those who wish to find in it authority for Sunday-keeping, must first prove that the Lord's day is a proper term for the first day of the week, which they cannot do. It will not be necessary in this case, however, for them to try, for we have before us not only the English translation of the text, but the Greek text itself, and we know whereof we speak when we say that the word for "day," namely *hēmera*, does not once occur in the entire chapter; neither is there any word correspond-

ing to it, nor anything to indicate that it, rather than some other word, should be supplied. Why, then, was the word "day" inserted by the translators? We leave them to answer.

It will be asked, "If you throw out the term 'Lord's day,' what word or words should be supplied to make the sense complete?" Read the passage once more carefully, and you will see. Of what does it treat? Of the Lord's Supper, and that alone. The Greek word for "table" agrees with the adjective *kuriakēn*, and if supplied makes better sense than does the word "day." For while there is reason in saying that those who are at variance should not approach the Lord's table until they become reconciled, there is none in saying that such should not observe a certain day, or meet together on it.

But let this pass. It is not worth while to argue long over the question whether or not the "Teaching of the Apostles," so called, speaks of the Lord's day. When the document first appeared, a prominent religious journal said that it tended strongly to "make keepers of the first day more confident of their position than heretofore." What must have been their former confidence in their position? If a single casual expression in an anonymous document that is known to be a forgery, and which was found with some other forgeries that are worse than trash, tends to make Sunday-keepers more confident of their position, what becomes of their boasted New Testament authority for Sunday-keeping? Can it be that they regard the "Teaching" as superior to the New Testament, and therefore capable of strengthening its positions? No; the statement was simply an admission of what everyone who can read may find out for himself,

namely, that the New Testament gives not the slightest warrant for Sunday-keeping. Surely it would be a pity to take from Sunday advocates the strong ground of confidence that they have in the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles"! We will not dispute the passage with them any further. They are welcome to all that they can get out of it.

A section from chapter 8 will serve to show the proclivities of the unknown writer of this now famous document. It is as follows: "But let not your fasts be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week, but do ye fast on the fourth day and the preparation (Friday)."

Now here is a plain command, and we wait to see how many of those who are almost willing to swear by the "Teaching" will obey it. As yet we have seen no indication of any such design on the part of anyone. Nobody seems to have any special interest in this portion of the precious relic. And this again proves our statement that nobody really believes that the "Teaching" carries with it any weight of authority. It simply gives the modern Athenians something new to talk about, and a new chance to exercise their wits in finding excuses for not obeying the commandment of the Lord. It would be impossible to convince the religious world that they ought to fast on Wednesdays and Fridays; if such a thing were attempted they would immediately ask for Scripture proof. And yet there is as much reason for fasting regularly on those days, or even for keeping them holy, as there is for keeping Sunday.

If one were so disposed, he might show that the "Teaching" recognizes the seventh day as the true Sab-

bath; for it calls Friday the preparation. But we hope that no one who regards with reverence the commandment of Jehovah, will ever humiliate the Sabbath, which has for its backing that sacred word, by quoting in its behalf from such a source as the document now under consideration.

In chapter 6 we have this comforting bit of advice:—

"If thou art able to bear all the yoke of the Lord, thou wilt be perfect; but if thou art not able, what thou art able that do."

Which strongly reminds us of the Quaker's reputed counsel to his son. Said he: "John, thee must be honest; but if thee cannot be honest, be as honest as thee can."

Dr. Riddle is of the opinion that the "simplicity" of the "Teaching," "almost amounting to childishness," is proof that it is not a forgery, his idea evidently being that a man who would forge a document, would try to make it appear worthy of acceptance. However that may be, its simplicity is apparent, and an instance of it is herewith given:—

"Let every apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord. But he shall not remain except one day; but if there be need, also the next; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet."—*Chap. 11.*

The seventh chapter of the "Teaching" is as follows:—

"And concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first said all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if thou have not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, in warm. But if thou have not either, pour out water thrice upon the head in the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism let the baptizer fast, and the bap-

tized, and whatever others can; but thou shalt order the baptized to fast one or two days before."

The writer of this document was what would in these days be called a very "liberal" man. His advice is, "Baptize in running water if you can; if you cannot, then in some other; if you can't get cold water, use warm; and if you can't baptize at all, do something else, and it will do just as well." If we knew when this was written, it might throw some light on the date at which sprinkling or pouring came to be substituted for baptism. But we have the best of evidence that as late as the middle of the third century nothing but immersion was regarded as baptism; and therefore we know that at least the seventh chapter of the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" was written not less than two hundred years after the death of the apostles.

But the weakness or wickedness of the document is evident in the very first chapter, which contains the following:—

"Woe to him that taketh; for if one that is in need taketh, he shall be guiltless; but he that is not in need shall give account wherefore he took and whereunto; and being in durance shall be questioned touching what he did, and he shall not go out thence until he give back the last farthing."

Here this precious "Teaching" teaches that it is all right for a man to steal if he is in need. The man who needs clothes may steal them; and the man who needs a horse may "take" it, and both "shall be guiltless." Fortunately for society, our laws have not been modeled after the standard of this much prized "Teaching."

It is but just to say that in the Christian Literature Company's edition, it says: "For if one having need *re-*

ceiveth, he is guiltless," etc., using the word "receive" instead of "take." This is evidently out of sympathy for the reputation of the writer of the "Teaching," for both the original and the context show that nothing but stealing is meant. For the next clause says of the one who "takes" when he has no need, that "coming into straits (confinement), he shall pay the penalty;" and Bishop Coxe calls special attention to this, saying that it probably means imprisonment. This shows that stealing is meant, and not simply the receiving of a thing as a gift.

The following, however, is a fit accompaniment of the instruction concerning stealing:—

"Be not a stretcher forth of the hands to receive and a drawer of them back to give. If thou hast *aught*, through thy hands thou shalt give ransom for thy sins."—*Chap. 4.*

Here we have the Roman Catholic doctrine of atoning for sins by the payment of money. It is no wonder that the writer of this document, holding such a doctrine as this, should counsel a needy man to steal, since by paying to the priest a part of his ill-gotten gain he could free himself from sin.

But what more need be said? Enough has been given to convince anybody who is open to conviction, that the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles," like the writings attributed to Hermas, Barnabas, and Ignatius, is nothing but a Catholic document, one of those writings which grew out of the working of the "mystery of iniquity," and which form the foundation of that "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

CHAPTER IX.

IRENÆUS.

THE birth of Irenæus is placed by some authors as early as 67 A. D., and by others as late as 140 A. D. As evidence that there is no exact knowledge in regard to the matter, it is necessary only to state that the years 108 and 120 A. D., and several other dates, are also given. But the exact date is a matter of little moment; it is enough to know that he lived sometime in the second century.

The writings of Irenæus are quite extensive, and are very greatly lauded; yet it has been well said that "their preciousness bears no proportion to their bulk." A writer in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* (January, 1869), says: "It would be possible to compress into a very few pages all the statements of fact that can be deemed really valuable to us at the present day." In spite of all the praise that is lavished upon the Fathers, the same thing may be said of all of them. Indeed, we may go further, and say that although their writings contain, as a matter of necessity, some statements of fact, and some principles of truth, if not one of the so-called Christian Fathers had ever written a line, the amount of useful knowledge in the world would not be one *iota* less than it now is, and the Christian church would be far better off.

Killen speaks of Irenæus thus:—

"Irenæus is commonly called the disciple of Polycarp; but it is reported that he was also under the tuition of

a less intelligent preceptor, Papias of Hierapolis. This teacher . . . . is noted as the earliest ecclesiastical writer who held the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ at Jerusalem during the millennium. 'These views,' says Eusebius, 'he appears to have adopted in consequence of having misunderstood the apostolic narratives. . . . For he was a man of very slender intellect, as is evident from his discourses.' His pupil Irenæus possessed a much superior capacity; but even his writings are not destitute of puerilities; and it is not improbable that he derived some of the errors to be found in them from his weak-minded teacher."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraph 10.*

It may be interesting to the reader to know a little more of the weak-minded man whose instruction Irenæus enjoyed. Dr. Schaff (History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, sec. 121), says of him:—

"Papias, a disciple of John (?) and friend of Polycarp, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, till towards the middle of the second century, was a pious man, and well read in the Scriptures, but credulous and weak-minded. He entertained a grossly materialistic view of the millennium. He collected with great zeal the oral traditions of the apostles respecting the discourses and works of Jesus, and published them under the title: 'Explanations of the Lord's Discourses,' in five books. Although this work (according to Gallandi and Pitra) maintained itself down to the thirteenth century, yet we possess only some fragments of it in Irenæus and Eusebius, which, together with a few valuable notices, in regard, for example, to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, contain perfectly monstrous and fabulous inventions."

The truthfulness of this last remark is amply proved by the following prophecy which Papias puts into the mouth of the Lord:—

"As the elders who saw John the disciple of the Lord

remembered that they had heard from him how the Lord taught in regard to those times, and said: 'The days will come in which vines shall grow, having each ten thousand branches, and in each branch ten thousand twigs, and in each true twig ten thousand shoots, and in every one of the shoots ten thousand clusters, and on every one of the clusters ten thousand grapes, and every grape when pressed will give five-and-twenty metretes of wine. And when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, "I am a better cluster, take me; bless the Lord through me." In like manner, (he said) that a grain of wheat would produce ten thousand ears, and that every ear would have ten thousand grains, and every grain would yield ten pounds of clear, pure, fine flour.'"—*Fragment 4.*

It would perhaps be unjust to call Papias a phenomenal liar, but we can safely say that he gave unbounded license to his imagination, and took great liberties with the truth. Such was the character of the man who assisted to prepare Irenæus for his position as a Father of the church. That Irenæus was a worthy pupil of such a master, is indicated by the following:—

"In theology Irenæus is the first who, if he be rightly interpreted, suggests the disastrous view that Christ's ransom of our race was paid to Satan—a notion which occurs in the writings of theologians almost unquestioned till the days of Anselm. Even as regards events which were then recent Irenæus is a most unsafe authority."—*History of Interpretation (Farrar), p. 176.*

Mosheim makes the following statement concerning the number and condition of the writings of Irenæus, which have reached us:—

"Of his writings in support of the Christian faith, which were not a few, none besides his five books against heresies have come down to our time; and indeed these

(with the exception of the first) have reached us merely through the medium of a wretchedly barbarous and obscure Latin translation."—*Ecclesiastical Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 37.*

On this last point the translators of Irenæus have made a very telling statement in their introductory notice. It is one which those who so highly extol the value of his writings, seem to have entirely overlooked. Here is what they say:—

"The great work of Irenæus, now for the first time translated into English, is unfortunately no longer extant in the original. It has come down to us only in an ancient Latin version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius. The text, both Latin and Greek, is often most uncertain. Only three MMS. of the work 'Against Heresies' are at present known to exist. Others, however, were used in the earliest printed editions put forth by Erasmus. And as these codices were more ancient than any now available, it is greatly to be regretted that they have disappeared or perished. One of our difficulties throughout, has been to fix the readings we should adopt, especially in the first book. Varieties of reading, actual or conjectural, have been noted only when some point of special importance seemed to be involved.

"After the text has been settled, according to the best judgment which can be formed, the work of translation remains; and that is, in this case, a matter of no small difficulty. Irenæus, even in the original Greek, is often a very obscure writer. At times he expresses himself with remarkable clearness and terseness; but, upon the whole, his style is very involved and prolix. And the Latin version adds to these difficulties of the original, by being itself of the most barbarous character. In fact, it is often necessary to make a conjectural re-translation of

it into Greek, in order to obtain some inkling of what the author wrote. Dodwell supposes this Latin version to have been made about the end of the fourth century; but as Tertullian seems to have used it, we must rather place it in the beginning of the third. Its author is unknown, but he was certainly little qualified for his task. We have endeavored to give as close and accurate a translation of the work as possible, but there are not a few passages in which a guess can only be made as to the probable meaning."

One way of arriving at a knowledge of an unknown quantity is to guess what the half of it is, and then multiply that by two. This process will invariably give the correct result, provided you make no mistake in guessing at the half. We have also heard that when farmers who live in the woods, far from civilization, wish to ascertain the exact weight of a hog, and have no scales, they lay a plank across a log, place the animal on one end of the plank, pile stones on the other end until they exactly balance the hog, and then they guess how much the stones weigh. This has never been known to fail to give the exact weight of a hog, unless a mistake was made in guessing the weight of the stones.

Very similar to these methods was the means adopted by the translators of Irenæus. The original of his writings (with a single exception) nowhere exists. The small portion that has come to us in the original Greek, shows that Irenæus could with difficulty express himself so as to be understood. This obscurity is greatly increased by the wretched Latin translation in which his writings are extant. So whenever the translators came to a passage out of which they could not for their lives make any sense, they wrote out a Greek sentence which they *guessed*

might be what Irenæus said, and then translated that into English, and lo! we have the writings of Irenæus. When writings may be reproduced in that way, there is certainly no reason for any man's writings to be lost.

Of course the above method was not pursued with all of the works of Irenæus, and there is no doubt but that we have some things just as he wrote them; but the question is, Which are the genuine and which are not? The guess-work of the translators throws doubt upon everything. But it really makes very little difference. If it were all conjecture, or if all were lost, the world would be better off. No doubt the part which the translators evolved from their own imagination, is better than what Irenæus actually wrote.

With the facts recorded in the last quotation before us, it is scarcely worth while to make any extracts from Irenæus. Each reader might do a little guessing on his own account, and produce the writings of that Father in a style to suit his own individual taste. But that we may know something of the character of that which is generally credited to him, a few specimens are appended. The following is from "Irenæus against Heresies:"—

"Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church,—those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good-pleasure of the Father. But (it is also incumbent) to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession, and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, (looking upon them) either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed up and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites, acting thus for the sake of lucre and vainglory."—*Book 4, chap. 26, par. 2.*

This, it will be seen, tends solely to the up-building of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. While Origen and Tertullian were very versatile, introducing many heresies, Irenæus did his chief service to the Roman Catholic Church in the line of establishing the Episcopal succession, and preparing the minds of the people for the acceptance of one "universal bishop."

The following, which teaches obedience to the Church of Rome, shows how early the Romish leaven began to work:—

"Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; (we do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its pre-eminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolic tradition has been preserved continuously by those (faithful men) who exist everywhere.

"The blessed apostles, then, having founded and built up the church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate. Of this Linus, Paul makes mention in the epistles to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus; and after him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement was allotted the bishopric. This man, as he had seen the blessed apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the apostles still echoing (in his ears), and their tradi-

tions before his eyes. Nor was he alone (in this), for there were many still remaining who had received instructions from the apostles. In the time of this Clement, no small dissension having occurred among the brethren at Corinth, the church in Rome dispatched a most powerful letter to the Corinthians, exhorting them to peace, renewing their faith, and declaring the tradition which it had lately received from the apostles, proclaiming the one God, omnipotent, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Creator of man, who brought on the deluge, and called Abraham, who led the people from the land of Egypt, spake with Moses, set forth the law, sent the prophets, and who has prepared fire for the devil and his angels. From this document, whosoever chooses to do so, may learn that he, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, was preached by the churches, and may also understand the apostolical tradition of the church, since this epistle is of older date than these men who are now propagating falsehood, and who conjure into existence another God beyond the Creator and the Maker of all existing things. To this Clement there succeeded Evaristus. Alexander followed Evaristus; then, sixth from the apostles, Sixtus was appointed; after him, Telephorus, who was gloriously martyred; then Hyginus; after him, Pius; then after him, Anicetus. Soter having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherius does now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, hold the inheritance of the episcopate. In this order, and by this succession, the ecclesiastical tradition from the apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the church from the apostles until now, and handed down in truth."—*Id., book 3, chap. 3, paragraphs 2, 3.*

Still further we read to the same intent:—

"Since therefore we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich

man (depositing his money) in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth: so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers. On this account are we bound to avoid *them*, but to make choice of the things pertaining to the church with the utmost diligence, and to lay hold of the tradition of the truth. For how stands the case? Suppose there arise a dispute relative to some important question among us, should we not have recourse to the most ancient churches with which the apostles held constant intercourse, and learn from them what is certain and clear in regard to the present question? For how should it be if the apostles themselves had not left us writings? Would it not be necessary (in that case) to follow the course of the tradition which they handed down to those to whom they did commit the churches?" —*Id., chap. 4, paragraph 1.*

It may be claimed that Irenæus did not write this, but that it is the work of someone who lived at a later date, and who wished to have the weight of Irenæus's influence in behalf of Roman supremacy. Of course the one who makes that claim will never be found quoting from Irenæus in behalf of anything else, for if this is a forgery, any other portion may be a forgery also. But the fact remains that the writings of Irenæus, whoever produced them, favor the Roman Catholic usurpation. Tradition is by them exalted, and the people are exhorted to have recourse to "the most ancient churches," instead of to the Bible.

In proof of the statement made by Killen, that the writings of Irenæus "are not destitute of puerilities," we quote the following "reasons" which he gives to show why there are only four Gospels:—

"It is not possible that the Gospels can be either more

or fewer in number than they are. For, since there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principal winds, while the church is scattered throughout all the world, and the 'pillar and ground' of the church is the gospel and the spirit of life; it is fitting that she should have four pillars, breathing out immortality on every side, and vivifying men afresh. From which fact, it is evident that the Word, the Artificer of all, he that sitteth upon the cherubim, and contains all things, he who was manifested to men, has given us the gospel under four aspects, but bound together by one Spirit. As also David says, when entreating his manifestation, 'Thou that sittest between the cherubim, shine forth.' For the cherubim, too, were four-faced, and their faces were images of the dispensation of the Son of God. For (as the Scripture) says, 'The first living creature was like a lion,' symbolizing his effectual working, his leadership, and royal power; the second (living creature) was like a calf, signifiying (his) sacrificial and sacerdotal order; but 'the third had, as it were, the face as of a man,'—an evident description of his advent as a human being; 'the fourth was like a flying eagle,' pointing out the gift of the Spirit hovering with his wings over the church. And therefore the Gospels are in accord with these things, among which Christ Jesus is seated."—*Id., book 3, chap. 11, paragraph 8.*

That is fanciful enough, but it is not so bad as the following, which shows Irenæus to have been a fit companion of the one who stole the name of Barnabas to foist his idle imaginings upon the church:—

"Now the law has figuratively predicted all these, delineating man by the (various) animals: whatsoever of these, says (the Scripture), have a double hoof and ruminate, it proclaims as clean; but whatsoever of them do not possess one or other of these (properties), it sets aside by themselves as unclean. Who then are the clean? Those who make their way by faith steadily towards the Father

and the Son; for this is denoted by the steadiness of those which divide the hoof; and they meditate day and night upon the words of God, that they may be adorned with good works; for this is the meaning of the ruminants. The unclean, however, are those who do neither divide the hoof nor ruminate; that is, those persons who have neither faith in God, nor do meditate on his words; and such is the abomination of the Gentiles. But as to those animals which do indeed chew the cud, but have not the double hoof, are themselves unclean, we have in them a figurative description of the Jews, who certainly have the words of God in their mouth, but who do not fix their rooted steadfastness in the Father and in the Son; wherefore they are an unstable generation. For those animals which have the hoof all in one piece easily slip; but those which have it divided are more sure-footed, their cleft hoofs succeeding each other as they advance, and the one hoof supporting the other. In like manner, too, those are unclean which have the double hoof but do not ruminate: this is plainly an indication of all heretics, and of those who do not meditate on the words of God, neither are adorned with works of righteousness; to whom also the Lord says, 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say to you?' For men of this stamp do indeed say that they believe in the Father and the Son, but they never meditate as they should upon the things of God, neither are they adorned with works of righteousness; but, as I have already observed, they have adopted the lives of swine and of dogs, giving themselves over to filthiness, to gluttony, and recklessness of all sorts. Justly, therefore, did the apostle call all such 'carnal' and 'animal,'—(all those, namely) who through their own unbelief and luxury do not receive the divine Spirit, and in their various phases cast out from themselves the life-giving word, and walk stupidly after their own lusts: the prophets, too, spake of them as beasts of burden and wild beasts; custom likewise has viewed them in the light of cattle and irrational creatures; and the law has pronounced them unclean."—*Id., book 5, chap. 8, par 4.*

We are now prepared to listen to what Irenæus has to say about the Sabbath and Sunday, although what we have already read does not tend to make us listen with a great deal of reverence either for his opinion or his practice. In number 7 of the "Fragments from the Lost Writings of Irenæus," we read:—

"This (custom), of not bending the knee upon Sunday, is a symbol of the resurrection, through which we have been set free, by the grace of Christ, from sins, and from death, which has been put to death under him. Now this custom took its rise from apostolic times, as the blessed Irenæus, the martyr and bishop of Lyons, declares in his treatise 'On Easter,' in which he makes mention of Pentecost also; upon which (feast) we do not bend the knee, because it is of equal significance with the Lord's day, for the reason already alleged concerning it."

No explanation of this passage is needed. Whoever wishes to accept it along with all that Irenæas has written, is welcome to do so. *If* it is not a forgery, and *if* it was written at the time that Irenæus is supposed to have lived, then it simply shows that some slight reverence for Sunday existed quite early in the church, together with the other beginnings of apostasy from the Bible religion.

In a foot-note to fragment number 50, we find the following:—

"This extract is introduced as follows: 'For Irenæus bishop of Lyons, who was a contemporary of the disciple of the apostle, Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, and martyr, and for this reason is held in just estimation, wrote to an Alexandrian to the effect that it is right, with respect to the feast of the resurrection, that we should celebrate it upon the first day of the week.'"

That is to say, that somebody says that Irenæus, who acquired great renown from the fact that he lived at the

same time that Polycarp did, wrote to somebody else to the effect that the feast of the resurrection ought to be celebrated on the first day of the week. How he found out that any "feast of the resurrection" should ever be celebrated, this unknown deponent saith not.

Whether the following is favorable to the Sabbath of the fourth commandment or opposed to it, the writer is unable to determine. Whoever thinks that it is worth anything, is welcome to it:—

"And therefore the Lord reproved those who unjustly blamed him for having healed upon the Sabbath-days. For he did not make void, but fulfilled the law, by performing the offices of the high priest, propitiating God for men, and cleansing the lepers, healing the sick, and himself suffering death, that exiled man might go forth from condemnation, and might return without fear to his own inheritance.—*Irenæus against Heresies, book 4, chap. 8, paragraph 2.*

The following, however, most clearly teaches the necessity of obedience to all the commandments:—

"They (the Jews) had therefore a law, a course of discipline, and a prophecy of future things. For God at the first, indeed, warning them by means of natural precepts, which from the beginning he had implanted in mankind, that is, by means of the decalogue (which, if anyone does not observe, he has no salvation), did then demand nothing more of them. As Moses says in Deuteronomy, 'These are all the words which the Lord spake to the whole assembly of the sons of Israel on the mount, and he added no more; and he wrote them on two tables of stone, and gave them to me.' For this reason (he did so), that they who are willing to follow him might keep these commandments."—*Id., book 4, chap 15, paragraph 1.*

And the following does most emphatically assert the perpetuity of the law of God:—

"Preparing man for this life, the Lord himself did speak in his own person to all alike the words of the decalogue; and therefore, in like manner, do they remain permanently with us, receiving by means of his advent in the flesh, extension and increase, but not abrogation." —*Id., book 4, chap. 16, paragraph 4.*

It is to be hoped that no commandment-keeper will ever refer to these passages in Irenæus as evidence that Christ did not abrogate the law of God, the ten commandments. It is true that he did not abate one jot of the law, but the testimony of Irenæus does not make that fact any more certain. We know it because Christ himself has said so. We may not quote the Fathers as authority even when they tell the truth, for that would oblige us to accept their heresies. The above extracts are useful, however, to quote for the benefit of those who would fain derive comfort from Irenæus for the custom of observing Sunday, in opposition to the fourth precept of the decalogue.

Those who wish to take Irenæus as authority on any point, must accept his teaching on all points, and so, in addition to the exaltation of Rome, they must accept the doctrine of purgatory, for Irenæus says:—

"It was for this reason, too, that the Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching his advent there also, and (declaring) the remission of sins received by those who believe in him."—*Id., chap. 27, paragraph 2.*

The above doctrine of purgatory and probation after death is of course based upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; yet the following is a virtual contradiction of that theory. It is at any rate a plain statement of the fact that people do not go to Heaven at death:—

"If, then, the Lord observed the law of the dead, that he might become the first-begotten from the dead, and tarried until the third day 'in the lower parts of the earth;' then afterwards rising in the flesh, so that he even showed the print of the nails to his disciples, he thus ascended to the Father;—(if all these things occurred, I say), how must these men not be put to confusion, who allege that 'the lower parts' refer to this world of ours, but that their inner man, leaving the body here, ascends into the super-celestial place? For as the Lord 'went away in the midst of the shadow of death,' where the souls of the dead were, yet afterwards arose in the body, and after the resurrection was taken up (into Heaven), it is manifest that the souls of his disciples also, upon whose account the Lord underwent these things, shall go away into the invisible place allotted to them by God, and there remain until the resurrection, awaiting that event; then receiving their bodies, and rising in their entirety, that is bodily, just as the Lord arose, they shall come thus into the presence of God. 'For no disciple is above the Master, but everyone that is perfect shall be as his Master.' As our Master, therefore, did not at once depart, taking flight (to Heaven), but awaited the time of his resurrection prescribed by the Father, which had been also shown forth through Jonas, and rising again after three days was taken up (to Heaven), so ought we also to await the time of our resurrection prescribed by God and foretold by the prophets, and so, rising, be taken up, as many as the Lord shall account worthy of this (privilege)."—*Id., book 5, chap. 31, paragraph 2.*

The following extract is rather long, but it is a good example of the style of Irenæus, and, although it may be called a point of minor importance, it shows how readily false theories obtain credence, and are propagated among the people:—

"They, however, that they may establish their false

opinion regarding that which is written, 'to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord,' maintain that he preached for one year only, and then suffered in the twelfth month. (In speaking thus), they are forgetful to their own disadvantage, destroying his whole work, and robbing him of that age which is both more necessary and more honorable than any other; that more advanced age, I mean, during which also as a teacher he excelled all others. For how could he have had disciples, if he did not teach? And how could he have taught, unless he had reached the age of a master? For when he came to be baptized, he had not yet completed his thirtieth year, but was beginning to be about thirty years of age (for thus Luke, who has mentioned his years, has expressed it: 'Now Jesus was, as it were, beginning to be thirty years old,' when he came to receive baptism); and (according to these men) he preached only one year reckoning from his baptism. On completing his thirtieth year he suffered, being in fact still a young man, and who had by no means attained to advanced age. Now, that the first stage of early life embraces thirty years, and that this extends onwards to the fortieth year, everyone will admit; but from the fortieth and fiftieth year a man begins to decline towards old age, which our Lord possessed while he still fulfilled the office of a teacher, even as the gospel and all the elders testify; those who were conversant in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord, (affirming) that John conveyed to them that information. And he remained among them up to the times of Trajan. Some of them, moreover, saw not only John, but the other apostles also, and heard the very same account from them, and bear testimony as to the (validity of) the statement. Whom then should we rather believe? Whether such men as these, or Ptolemæus, who never saw the apostles, and who never even in his dreams attained to the slightest trace of an apostle?

"But, besides this, those very Jews who then disputed with the Lord Jesus Christ have most clearly indicated the same thing. For when the Lord said to them

'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad,' they answered him, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?' Now, such language is fittingly applied to one who has already passed the age of forty, without having as yet reached his fiftieth year, yet is not far from this latter period. But to one who is only thirty years old it would unquestionably be said, 'Thou art not yet forty years old.' For those who wished to convict him of falsehood would certainly not extend the number of his years far beyond the age which they saw he had attained; but they mentioned a period near his real age, whether they had truly ascertained this out of the entry in the public register, or simply made a conjecture from what they observed that he was above forty years old, and that he certainly was not one of only thirty years of age. For it is altogether unreasonable to suppose that they were mistaken by twenty years, when they wished to prove him younger than the times of Abraham. For what they saw, that they also expressed; and he whom they beheld was not a mere phantasm, but an actual being of flesh and blood. He did not then want much of being fifty years old; and, in accordance with that fact, they said to him, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?'"—*Id., book 2, chap. 22, paragraphs 5, 6.*

With respect to the assertion of Irenæus that the apostle John told the elders in Asia, that when Jesus taught he was upwards of forty years old, Harvey, who got out an edition of Irenæus, says:—

"The reader may here receive the unsatisfactory character of tradition, where a mere fact is concerned. From reasonings founded upon the evangelical history, as well as from a preponderance of external testimony, it is most certain that our Lord's ministry extended but little over three years; yet here Irenæus states that it included more than ten years, and appeals to a tradition derived, as he says, from those who had conversed with an apostle."—*Quoted in a foot-note, by Bishop Coxe.*

And Bishop Coxe also adds a note to the statement that Jesus did not lack much of being fifty years old when the conversation occurred which is recorded in the eighth chapter of John. He says:—

"This statement is simply astounding, and might seem a providential illustration of the worthlessness of mere tradition unsustained by the written word. No mere tradition could be more creditably authorized than this."

It is a pity that the bishop and other admirers of the Fathers have not always kept this fact in mind. If they had, they would not have lauded the Fathers as they have, for their writings are mostly tradition or speculation. Since it is admitted that everything must be sustained by the Bible, in order to be of any value, how much better it would be to go to the Bible direct for our information, without floundering through the bogs of patristic literature.

In his preface to the writings of Irenæus, Bishop Coxe says: "Not a little of what is contained in the following pages will seem almost unintelligible to the English reader. And it is scarcely more comprehensible to those who have pondered long on the original." Whoever wades through the entire mass will be convinced of the truth of that statement, and the following is one of the passages which will serve to convince him:—

"Moreover, *Jesus*, which is a word belonging to the proper tongue of the Hebrews, contains, as the learned among them declare, two letters and a half, and signifies that Lord who contains heaven and earth; for Jesus in the ancient Hebrew language means 'heaven,' while again 'earth' is expressed by the words *sura usser*. The word, therefore, which contains heaven and earth is just Jesus."—*Irenæus against Heresies, book 2, chap 24, paragraph 2.*

The bishop truly says that nothing can be made of these words. And the words "*sura usser*" betray not much more ignorance on the part of the writer than does his attempt to handle the Hebrew. Such ignorance and pedantry on the part of a modern writer would make him the laughing stock of all who should take the trouble to read his writings. But Irenæus is a "Father of the church," and so, forsooth, his senseless jargon must be looked upon with reverence and awe.

It appears, moreover, that Irenæus was almost as ignorant of Greek as he was of Hebrew, although he wrote in Greek. That is, he was an ignorant scribbler who made great pretensions to knowledge. In book 2, chapter 35, paragraph 3 of his work "Against Heresies," he says:—

"In like manner also, *Sabaoth*, when it is spelled by a Greek Omega in the last syllable (Sabaōth), denotes 'a voluntary agent;' but when it is spelled with a Greek Omicron—as, for instance, Sabaŏth—it expresses 'the first heaven.' In the same way, too, the word *Jaōth*, when the last syllable is made long and aspirated, denotes 'a predetermined measure;' but when it is written shortly by the Greek letter Omicron, namely, *Jaŏth*, it signifies 'one who puts evils to flight.'"

As Coxe says: "The author is here utterly mistaken. . . . The term Sabaoth is never written with an Omicron, either in the LXX., or by the Greek Fathers, but always with an Omega (*Σαβαωθ*)." But just think of the absurdity of writing such stuff "against heresies."

With one more example of the expository skill of Irenæus, we will take leave of him. It is from his wonderful refutation of all heresies:—

"Moreover, by the words they used this fact was pointed

out—that there is no other one who can confer upon the elder and younger church the (power of) giving birth to children, besides our Father. Now the father of the human race is the Word of God, as Moses points out when he says, 'Is not he thy father who hath obtained thee (by generation), and formed thee, and created thee?' At what time, then, did he pour out upon the human race the life-giving seed—that is, the Spirit of the remission of sins, through means of whom we are quickened? Was it not then, when he was eating with men, and drinking wine upon the earth? For it is said, 'The Son of man came eating and drinking;' and when he had lain down, he fell asleep, and took repose. As he does himself say in David, 'I slept, and took repose.' And because he used thus to act while he dwelt and lived among us, he says again, 'And my sleep became sweet unto me.' Now this whole matter was indicated through Lot, that the seed of the Father of all—that is, of the Spirit of God, by whom all things were made—was commingled and united with flesh—that is, with his own workmanship; by which commixture and unity the two synagogues—that is, the two churches—produced from their own father living sons to the living God.

"And while these things were taking place, his wife remained in (the territory of) Sodom, no longer corruptible flesh, but a pillar of salt which endures forever; and by those natural processes which appertain to the human race, indicating that the church also, which is the salt of the earth, has been left behind within the confines of the earth, and subject to human sufferings; and while entire members are often taken away from it, the pillar of salt still endures, thus typifying the foundation of the faith which maketh strong, and sends forward, children to their Father."—*Book 4, chap. 31, paragraphs 2, 3.*

In this Irenæus shows himself worthy to rank with the worst of the Fathers as a perverter of the simple statements of the Bible. How true it is that "the world

by wisdom knew not God." Those men were so imbued with the spirit of heathen philosophy, which consisted simply in a show of learning, to mystify and awe the simple-minded, that they could not come down to the plain, common-sense teaching of the Bible. Lot's drinking wine must needs be made a type of Christ; the children begotten by incestuous intercourse with his daughters is taken as a type of the church proceeding from God; and with the usual disregard of consistency, the pillar of salt, into which Lot's wife was turned, is made to represent the church which preserves the world, although that did not preserve anything. And that is a sample of the stuff that was written against heresies. Such childish trifling with the sacred text is well adapted to produce heresy and infidelity, and nothing else. And therefore the same verdict will have to be pronounced upon Irenæus as upon the other so-called Fathers. His intentions may have been good, but whatever influence his work has had, has been blighting to pure Christianity and to reverence for "the sincere milk of the word." No wonder he is an honored Father in the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER X.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

But little is known about the life of this man, except what is found in his own writings. That which is generally accepted is that he was born in the city of Shechem (the modern Nablous), in Samaria, about 114 A. D. He was a Gentile, however, and evidently from a family of some wealth and social standing, for he traveled extensively, and was liberally educated in the learning of those times. Before adopting Christianity, he was a professional heathen philosopher. According to Eusebius and some other historians, he suffered martyrdom at Rome, in A. D. 165, as the result of a plot laid for him by the philosophers of that city. The following extracts from reputable church historians give a good idea of his character as a man, and as a professed leader of the Christian religion. Bishop Coxe, in his introductory note to the "First Apology," says:—

"Justin was a Gentile, but born in Samaria, near Jacob's well. He must have been well educated: he had traveled extensively, and he seems to have been a person enjoying at least a competence. After trying all other systems, his elevated tastes and refined perceptions made him a disciple of Socrates and Plato."

It is to be hoped that few will indorse the statement immediately following the above, that "so he climbed towards Christ." If it is really true that Socrates and Plato were the steps by which Justin climbed toward

Christ, then he never reached Christ; for one might as soon expect to reach the top of a mountain by going down into a mine, or to reach Heaven by descending into the bottomless pit, as to reach Christ by studying Socrates and Plato. The great trouble with Justin and the others who are misnamed "Christian Fathers," is that their Christianity consisted largely of heathen philosophy. This it was that clouded their minds to the simple truth of the gospel, and made them such blind leaders of the blind. Whatever they learned of Christ, they learned in spite of their study of philosophy, and not because of it.

Bishop Coxe says further:—

"He wore his philosopher's gown after his conversion, as a token that he had attained the only true philosophy. And seeing, that, after the conflicts and tests of ages, it is the only philosophy that lasts and lives and triumphs, its discoverer deserves the homage of mankind."

The bishop's note on the philosopher's gown is worthy of more than passing notice. He says: "It survives in the pulpits of Christendom—Greek, Latin, Anglican, Lutheran, etc.—to this day, in slightly different forms." This is a remarkable admission to come from a bishop of the Anglican Church,—that the surplice of the Episcopal, Catholic, or Lutheran clergyman is a link that connects his religion with that of ancient paganism—a sign that he is not fully emancipated from the bondage of superstition. Of course there are very few nowadays who stop to think of the significance of the vestments of "the church;" but we may be sure that Justin Martyr had a distinct purpose in retaining his philosopher's gown after he professed Christianity. It was not a matter of con-

venience merely, but it signified that he was a philosopher still, but with a new idea. It signified that he could discern no incompatibility between Christianity and pagan philosophy. This conclusion is sustained by Dr. Killen, who says:—

"Justin, even after his conversion, still wore the philosopher's cloak, and continued to cherish an undue regard for the wisdom of the pagan sages. His mind never was completely emancipated from the influence of a system of false metaphysics; and thus it was that, whilst his views of various doctrines of the gospel remained confused, his allusions to them are equivocal, if not contradictory."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraph 6.*

The learned Neander testifies as follows:—

"Justin Martyr is remarkable, as the first among these apologists whose writings have reached us, and as the first of those better known to us, who became a teacher of the Christian church, in whom we observe an approximation between Christianity and the Grecian, but especially the Platonic philosophy."—*Rose's Neander, p. 410.*

Mosheim says:—

"With the Jews, contended in particular Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho; and likewise Tertullian; but neither of them, in the best manner; because they were not acquainted with the language and history of the Hebrews, and did not duly consider the subject."—*Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 7.*

And Schaff bears the following testimony:—

"Justin was a man of very extensive reading, enormous memory, inquiring spirit, and many profound ideas, but wanting in critical discernment. His mode of reasoning is often ingenious and convincing, but sometimes loose and

rambling, fanciful and puerile. His style is easy and vivacious, but diffuse and careless. He is the first of the church Fathers to bring classical scholarship and Platonic philosophy in contact with the Christian theology." —*Vol. 1, sec. 122.*

In view of these facts it is evident that Justin Martyr is really as unsafe a guide in matters of religion as Plato, or Socrates, or any other heathen philosopher. Nor can it be said that, although he himself may not be a safe teacher of theology, he may be relied on as a delineator of church customs in the second century, which may be followed; for, (1) The customs of the church at that time must necessarily have been perverted by the influx of pagans, and by the teaching and example of such men as Justin; and (2) Justin cannot be depended on as to matters of fact. Says Farrar:—

"Following in the footsteps of the rabbis he denies the plainest historical facts."—*History of Interpretation, p. 173.*

This being the case, it evidently will not do to place much reliance upon his word, whatever he may say. We can therefore rate the following as it deserves:—

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been

given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration."—*First Apology, chap. 67.*

Although Justin is so unreliable as to matters of fact, we may readily grant that this is a true statement of the custom of worship by some professed Christians in the latter part of the second century. Unfortunately Justin was not the only heathen philosopher who came into the church bringing his heathen philosophy and customs with him, and very many common people would naturally follow the lead of such men, so that the few who "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and practice" were lost to sight, and the church began to assume the color of paganism. This was the case whenever and wherever heathen philosophers accepted Christianity as merely another phase of their old-time philosophy. In the above account, the degeneration from primitive ordinances is further seen in the addition of water to the wine of the Lord's Supper. This perversion of the ordinance also appears in the following:—

"Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss. There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at his hands. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying Amen. This word Amen answers in the Hebrew language to (so be it). And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry away a portion." —*First Apology, chap. 65.*

It will be seen, however, that Justin did not regard Sunday as a rest day or a sacred day. He had always been accustomed to regard the first day of the week as a festival day, and had not changed his views when he adopted the form of Christianity. Only instead of pagan sacrifices on that day, he substituted the (perverted) forms of Christian worship. But he well knew that there was a difference between Sunday and Sabbath, as appears from the following:—

"The command of circumcision, again, bidding (them) always circumcise the children on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity through him who rose from the dead on the first day after the Sabbath (namely through) our Lord Jesus Christ. For the first day after the Sabbath, remaining the first of all the days, is called, however, the eighth, according to the number of all the days of the cycle, and (yet) remains the first."—*Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 41.*

The origin of the absurdity of calling Sunday the first day and the eighth day also, may be learned from the above. It is just such a piece of theological jugglery as might be expected from a semi-heathen philosopher.

Gibbon's statement that the philosophers regarded all systems of philosophy as equally false, is corroborated by the following three extracts from Justin's writings, which show that although a professed Christian, he assumed the right to dispense with all the requirements of the Bible. In his talk with Trypho the Jew he says:—

"The new law requires you to keep perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you: and if you eat unleavened bread, you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances; if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbaths of God. If anyone has impure hands, let him wash and be pure."—*Id., chap. 12.*

This shows that although he recognized the difference between Sabbath and Sunday, as has already been shown, he did not believe in keeping any Sabbath. The same appears in the following:—

"For, tell me, did God wish the priests to sin when they offer the sacrifices on the Sabbaths? Or those to sin, who are circumcised and do circumcise on the Sabbaths; since he commands that on the eighth day—even though it happen to be a Sabbath—those who are born shall be always circumcised? or could not the infants be operated upon one day previous or one day subsequent to the Sabbath, if he knew that it is a sinful act upon the Sabbath? Or why did he not teach those—who are called righteous and pleasing to him, who lived before Moses and Abraham, who were not circumcised in their

foreskin, and observed no Sabbaths—to keep these institutions?"—*Id., chap. 27.*

Some may rejoice to learn that Justin declares that the righteous ones who lived before Moses and Abraham did not keep Sabbath; but the more cautious ones, who desire only the truth, will ask where he obtained that information, and will question his right to set himself up as one whose unsupported word must be accepted. In the following he teaches the abolition of all law:—

"For the law promulgated on Horeb is now old, and belongs to yourselves alone; but *this* is for all universally. Now, law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it, and a covenant which comes after in like manner has put an end to the previous one; and an eternal and final law—namely, Christ—has been given to us, and the covenant is trustworthy, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance." —*Id., chap. 11.*

Let no one presume to quote Justin Martyr as authority for Sunday-keeping, unless he is willing also to accept his *dictum* that the law of God is abolished.

Compare the following with Eze. 14:14, and Justin's untrustworthiness as a quoter of Scripture will be apparent:—

"Some injunctions and acts were likewise mentioned in reference to the mystery of Christ, on account of the hardness of your people's hearts. And that this is so, God makes known in Ezekiel, (when) he said concerning it: 'If Noah and Jacob and Daniel should beg either sons or daughters, the request would not be granted them.'"—*Id., chap. 44.*

This is not an isolated instance. Surely a man who cannot quote Scripture correctly is not to be trusted as a teacher of it.

Again compare the following with the Scripture record:—

"Moreover, the prescription that twelve bells be attached to the (robe) of the high priest, which hung down to the feet, was a symbol of the twelve apostles, who depend on the power of Christ, the eternal Priest; and through their voice it is that all the earth has been filled with the glory and grace of God and of his Christ."—*Id., chap. 42.*

Not content with making a far-fetched comment upon Scripture, he has manipulated the text to accommodate his proposed comment. The Scripture nowhere tells the number of bells that were upon the high priest's robe.

Like all the Fathers, Justin was very shy of accepting any part of the Bible as literal. Speaking of the account of the three angels who came to Abraham, and for whom the patriarch prepared a meal, which they ate, Justin says:—

"I would say that the Scripture which affirms they ate bears the same meaning as when we would say about fire that it has devoured all things; yet it is not certainly understood that they ate, masticating with teeth and jaws. So that not even here should we be at a loss about anything, if we are acquainted even slightly with figurative modes of expression, and able to rise above them."—*Id., chap. 57.*

Exactly; not here nor anywhere else should we be at a loss to interpret the Scriptures, if we adopted the methods of Justin and the other Fathers. Just teach that they mean something different from what they say, and you will be all right; and the farther you get from the plain declaration of the text, the nearer right you are, according to the Fathers. That method is a very easy one, but it will ever fail to promote Christian

growth. The "sincere milk of the word" alone can bring men up to "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

Following is another instance of Justin's speculative exposition:—

"'You know, then, sirs,' I said, 'that God has said in Isaiah to Jerusalem: "I saved thee in the deluge of Noah." By this which God said was meant that the mystery of saved men appeared in the deluge. For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge, *i. e.*, with his own wife, his three sons and their wives, being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when he arose from the dead, forever the first in power. For Christ, being the first-born of every creature, became again the chief of another race regenerated by himself through water, and faith, and wood, containing the mystery of the cross; even as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters with his household. Accordingly, when the prophet says, "I saved thee in the times of Noah," as I have already remarked, he addresses the people who are equally faithful to God, and possess the same signs.'"—*Id., chap. 138.*

One hardly knows whether to be amused or indignant at the cool assumption which this half-heathen philosopher shows in attempting to give a Jew instruction out of the Old Testament Scriptures. We may be quite sure that his fanciful theories did not make any great impression on Trypho. But they served to puff up Justin with a wonderful sense of his own importance, and have furnished weak-kneed Protestants with material with which to prove doctrines that cannot be found in the Bible.

The careful reader will see, however, that in the above passage Justin has no reference whatever to the first day of the week as a day of rest; of such a thing he seems

to have had no knowledge. But he is simply making the best argument that he knows how to make to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Of the prophecies which directly foretold the coming of Christ, the character of his work, and the time and object of his death and resurrection, he seems to have been ignorant, and all his ingenuity was expended in trying to make something out of nothing. His argument amounts to this: "There were eight persons saved in the ark; therefore Christ rose on the eighth day as the Saviour of men." Very profound, isn't it? Whoever is at all familiar with Roman Catholic controversial writings, will recognize the source whence Catholic theologians learn to dispute.

But Justin finds in the ark two lines of proof concerning Christ. The first is that the eight persons signified that Christ was to rise on the eighth day, and the second is that the wood of which the ark was composed symbolized the wood of the cross. In this also we discover the Roman Catholic devotion to the figure and sign of the cross. The heathen had no knowledge of a religion which changes man's nature; everything was formal with them. So when they nominally accepted Christianity, they looked upon the cross as the symbol of the new religion, and practically substituted it for the charms and shrines (see Acts 19:24), which they had reverenced while professed pagans. To those who regard Justin as so illustrious a Father, the following four passages from his writings are recommended:—

"'When the people,' replied I, 'waged war with Amalek, and the son of Nave (Nun) by name Jesus (Joshua), led the fight, Moses himself prayed to God, stretching out both hands, and Hur with Aaron supported

them during the whole day, so that they might not hang down when he got wearied. For if he gave up any part of this sign, which was an imitation of the cross, the people were beaten, as is recorded in the writings of Moses; but if he remained in this form, Amalek was proportionally defeated, and he who prevailed prevailed by the cross. For it was not because Moses so prayed that the people were stronger, but because, while one who bore the name of Jesus (Joshua) was in the forefront of the battle, he himself made the sign of the cross. For who of you knows not that the prayer of one who accompanies it with lamentation and tears, with the body prostrate, or with bended knees, propitiates God most of all? But in such a manner neither he nor any other one, while sitting on a stone, prayed. Nor even the stone symbolized Christ, as I have shown.'"—*Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 90.*

That is to say that the army of Israel prevailed, not because Moses prayed, but because he stretched out his hands in the form of a cross. This is expressly stated in the above, and also in the latter part of the following passage:—

"'Let him be glorified among his brethren; his beauty is (like) the firstling of a bullock; his horns the horns of an unicorn; with these shall he push the nations from one end of the earth to another.' Now, no one could say or prove that the horns of an unicorn represent any other fact or figure than the type which portrays the cross. For the one beam is placed upright, from which the highest extremity is raised up into a horn, when the other beam is fitted onto it, and the ends appear on both sides as horns joined onto the one horn. And the part which is fixed in the center, on which are suspended those who are crucified, also stands out like a horn; and it also looks like a horn conjoined and fixed with the other horns. And the expression, 'With these shall he push as with horns the nations from one end of the earth to

another,' is indicative of what is now the fact among all the nations. For some out of all the nations, through the power of this mystery, having been so pushed, that is, pricked in their hearts, have turned from vain idols and demons to serve God. But the same figure is revealed for the destruction and condemnation of the unbelievers; even as Amalek was defeated and Israel victorious when the people came out of Egypt, by means of the type of the stretching out of Moses's hands, and the name of Jesus (Joshua), by which the son of Nave (Nun) was called."—*Id., chap. 91.*

The reader is requested to give special attention to the first part of the above, which purports to be an exposition of the blessing which Moses pronounced upon Joseph. (See Duet. 33:17.) No matter what the prophecy, Justin could see nothing more in it than some likeness to the form of the material cross. Of the power of the cross as standing for the atoning sacrifice of Christ, he seems to have had little if any conception; the material cross was everything to him, taking the place of the charms and images of his old heathen days.

It seems almost a waste of valuable space to quote so much of this stuff, and yet it is only by so doing that the reader can be able for himself properly to rate Justin as an expositor. The following is a notable instance of Justin's narrow view of the Scriptures, and of the feeble arguments by which he and the best of his class attempted to convince the Jews and the heathen:—

"And when I had quoted this, I added, 'Hear, then, how this man, of whom the Scriptures declare that he will come again in glory after his crucifixion, was symbolized both by the tree of life, which was said to have been planted in Paradise, and by those events which should happen to all the just. Moses was sent with a rod to

effect the redemption of the people; and with this in his hands at the head of the people, he divided the sea. By this he saw the water gushing out of the rock; and when he cast a tree into the waters of Marah, which were bitter, he made them sweet. Jacob, by putting rods into the water-troughs, caused the sheep of his uncle to conceive, so that he should obtain their young. With his rod the same Jacob boasts that he had crossed the river. He said that he had seen a ladder, and the Scripture has declared that God stood above it. But that this was not the Father, we have proved from the Scriptures. And Jacob, having poured oil on a stone in the same place, is testified to by the very God who appeared to him, that he had anointed a pillar to the God who appeared to him. And that the stone symbolically proclaimed Christ, we have also proved by many scriptures; and that the unguent, whether it was of oil, or of *stacte*, or of any other compounded sweet balsams, had reference to him, we have also proved, inasmuch as the word says: "Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." For indeed all kings and anointed persons obtained from him their share in the names of kings and anointed: just as he himself received from the Father the titles of King, and Christ, and Priest, and Angel, and such like other titles which he bears or did bear. Aaron's rod, which blossomed, declared him to be the high priest, Isaiah prophesied that a rod would come forth from the root of Jesse, (and this was) Christ. And David says that the righteous man is "like the tree that is planted by the channels of waters, which should yield its fruit in its season, and whose leaf should not fade." Again, the righteous is said to flourish like the palm tree. God appeared from a tree to Abraham, as it is written, near the oak in Mamre. The people found seventy willows and twelve springs after crossing the Jordan. David affirms that God comforted him with a rod and staff. Elisha, by casting a stick into the River Jordan, recovered the iron part of the ax with which the

sons of the prophets had gone to cut down trees to build the house in which they wished to read and study the law and commandments of God; even as our Christ, by being crucified on the tree, and by purifying (us) with water, has redeemed us, though plunged in the direst offenses which we have committed, and has made (us) a house of prayer and adoration. Moreover, it was a rod that pointed out Judah to be the father of Tamar's sons by a great mystery.'"—*Id., chap. 86.*

One more extract shall suffice on the subject of the cross. In this "apology" to the rulers, he made the following final appeal:—

"But in no instance, not even in any of those called sons of Jupiter, did they intimate the being crucified; for it was not understood by them, all the things said of it having been put symbolically. And this, as the prophet foretold, is the greatest symbol of his power and rule; as is also proved by the things which fall under our observation. For consider all the things in the world, whether without this form they could be administered or have any community. For the sea is not traversed except that trophy which is called a sail abide safe in the ship; and the earth is not ploughed without it; diggers and mechanics do not their work except with tools which have this shape. And the human form differs from that of the irrational animals in nothing else than in its being erect and having the hands extended, and having on the face extending from the forehead what is called the nose, through which there is respiration for the living creature; and this shows no other form than that of the cross. And so it was said by the prophet, 'The breath before our face is the Lord Christ.' And the power of this form is shown by your own symbols on what are called 'vexilla' (banners) and trophies, with which all your state processions are made, using these as the insignia of your power and government, even though you do so unwittingly. And with this form you consecrate the images

of your emperors when they die, and you name them gods by inscriptions. Since, therefore, we have urged you both by reason and by an evident form, and to the utmost of our ability, we know that now we are blameless even though you disbelieve; for our part is done and finished."—*First Apology, chap. 55.*

Surely that should have convinced them of the truth of the Christian religion—as Justin understood it. In fact, it was just such arguments that did bring the heathen world over to the *profession* of Christianity. When the Christian religion was narrowed down to the material cross, and to the making of the sign of the cross, and the heathen were told that this cross was represented everywhere and in everything, and that whatever prosperity they had while heathen was due to the ubiquitous figure of the cross, what was there to keep them from adopting it? They were convinced that Christianity was the universal religion—the religion of nature—and so they turned their temples into churches; the image which they had worshiped as Jupiter, they now worshiped as Christ; the cross became their household god; the vestal virgins gave place to nuns; the peripatetic philosophers became mendicant friars, and so eventually paganism became Roman Catholicism.

But Justin was not limited in his arguments to the sign of the cross. He knew how to reach the minds of the heathen. For example, read the following:—

"But since sensation remains to all who have ever lived, and eternal punishment is laid up (*i. e.*, for the wicked), see that ye neglect not to be convinced, and to hold as your belief, that these things are true. For let even necromancy, and the divinations you practice by immaculate children, and the evoking of departed hu-

man souls, and those who are called among the magi, Dream-senders and Assistant-spirits (Familiars), and all that is done by those who are skilled in such matters—let these persuade you that even after death souls are in a state of sensation; and those who are seized and cast about by the spirits of the dead, whom all call demoniacs or madmen; and what you repute as oracles, both of Amphilochus, Dodona, Pytho, and as many other such as exist; and the opinions of your authors, Empedocles and Pythagoras, Plato and Socrates, and the pit of Homer, and the descent of Ulysses to inspect these things, and all that has been uttered of a like kind."—*Id., chap. 18.*

Notice that in this, as in the other instances, he does not argue from any high standard, but simply labors to show that their old religion is practically the same as Christianity. This quotation shows that Justin had never given up his belief in necromancy, and it shows also that the Christian church was even then being corrupted by heathen magic, which is what was now seen in the manifestations of modern Spiritualism. Yet although Justin thus speaks of the soul as surviving the body, and acting consciously independent of it, the following is an evidence of his inconsistency as a teacher. He was not above taking positions that were directly contradictory:—

"For as in the case of a yoke of oxen, if one or other is loosed from the yoke, neither of them can plough alone; so neither can soul or body alone effect anything, if they be unyoked from their communion."—*Justin on the Resurrection, chap. 8.*

But if this is true, the other is not, and if he told the truth when he said that the dead are conscious and do communicate with the living, then he did not tell the truth here. Whichever view of the matter is taken,

Justin stands convicted of teaching contradictory views, and therefore of being an unreliable man. As a matter of fact, he told the truth in the latter instance; if he had not taught anything inconsistent with that, he might not have attained the dignity of a Father of the Roman Catholic Church, but he might have had the higher honor of being a humble disciple—a doer of the word.

Lastly, as final proof that Justin used the Bible as a curiosity box, and nothing more, we cite the following:—

"Attend therefore to what I say. The marriages of Jacob were types of that which Christ was about to accomplish. For it was not lawful for Jacob to marry two sisters at once. And he serves Laban for (one of) the daughters; and being deceived in (the obtaining of) the younger, he again served seven years. Now Leah is your people and synagogue; but Rachel is our church. And for these, and for the servants in both, Christ even now serves. For while Noah gave to the two sons the seed of the third as servants, now on the other hand Christ has come to restore both the free sons and the servants amongst them, conferring the same honor on all of them who keep his commandments; even as the children of the free women and the children of the bond-women born to Jacob were all sons, and equal in dignity. And it was foretold what each should be according to rank and according to foreknowledge. Jacob served Laban for speckled and many-spotted sheep; and Christ served, even to the slavery of the cross, for the various and many formed races of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the cross. Leah was weak-eyed; for the eyes of your souls are excessively weak. Rachel stole the gods of Laban, and has hid them to this day; and we have lost our paternal and material gods. Jacob was hated for all time by his brother; and we now, and our Lord himself, are hated by you and by all men, though we are brothers by nat-

ure. Jacob was called Israel; and Israel has been demonstrated to be the Christ, who is, and is called, Jesus." —*Dialogue with Trypho, chap. 134.*

It is submitted in all candor, that if Justin had been a real student of the Bible, and had had any real knowledge of Christianity, he could not have thought to advance its claims by such flimsy and childish arguments. They are very interesting as an exhibition of his ingenuity; but sharpness is neither depth nor breadth. A person of vivid imagination may see all manner of figures in the burning coals, and thus it was with Justin. The Bible was to him only a book full of curiosities; therefore the final verdict must be that while he surpasses most of the other Fathers in knowledge of the *words* of the Bible, he rarely quotes it in a sensible manner. He quotes in a parrot-like manner what he had committed to memory. Of the meaning of the Scripture he was more ignorant than any child ten years of age would be, that has had the benefit of Christian training. We may not censure him or any other man for his ignorance; but we may justly censure those who set forth his ignorance as wisdom, and who would have the people look to vacancy for substance, to ignorance for wisdom, to darkness for light, and to error for righteousness. Justin must stand as a striking example of the impossibility for any man to fathom the deep things of God, by unaided human reason.

CHAPTER XI.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

This one of the Fathers was born about the middle of the second century, although whether in Athens or Alexandria is not known. It is most probable that he was a Greek, but as a writer he is connected only with Alexandria. Of his worthiness to be called one of the Fathers of the Christian church, the reader can decide for himself after reading what the best writers say of him, in connection with a few extracts from his own writings. The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of him:—

"Though he never succeeds in defining the office of reason on the field of authority, or in fully separating that of pagan thought which Christianity can assimilate, from that which it must reject, he is, nevertheless, exceedingly suggestive, and often eminently striking."

That is to say, he did not distinguish any difference between paganism and Christianity. Now "exceedingly suggestive" and "eminently striking" ideas may make very interesting reading, but we want something more than that alone in a leader of Christian thought. Nearly all the pagan writings which have been preserved, contain "exceedingly suggestive" and "eminently striking" ideas (some of them altogether too "suggestive"), but shall we therefore call them Christian Fathers? Of course not; and yet this is all the claim that Clement has to that title, because, as the above quotation teaches, he never became Christian enough to distinguish fairly between paganism and Christianity.

It was this lack of perception in the so-called Christian Fathers that filled the church with pagan ideas, and resulted in the great apostasy. No matter how honest Clement's intentions may have been, his pagan notions certainly made him most unfit to be a teacher in the Christian church.

McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia says of Clement:—

"Of the early Christian writers, Clement was the most learned in the history, philosophy, and science of the nations of his day, and the influence of his studies is apparent in his writings, which display rather the speculative philosopher than the accurate theologian—more the fanciful interpreter than the careful expounder of the Scriptures on true exegetical principles."

Learning and Christianity are by no means identical, nor is learning a substitute for Christianity. If a man is indeed a Christian, thoroughly settled in the simple principles of Christianity, then the more learning he has the better. But if a man is an opponent of Christianity, his learning can be only a curse; and even though he be friendly to Christianity, and a professed Christian, if he is ignorant of the simple, fundamental principles of the gospel, his learning is a curse to the cause which he professes; for many will be dazzled by the splendor of his genius, and will follow him into error; his learning is the *ignis-fatuus* which beguiles the confiding wayfarer to his destruction. To show that this was the case with Clement of Alexandria, we have only to quote the following from Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical Commentaries:"—

"When once this passion for philosophizing had taken possession of the minds of the Egyptian teachers and certain others, and had been gradually diffused by them

in various directions throughout the church, the holy and beautiful simplicity of early times very quickly disappeared, and was followed by a most remarkable and disastrous alteration in nearly the whole system of Christian discipline. This very important and deeply-to-be-regretted change had its commencement in the century now under review [the second], but it will be in the succeeding one that we shall have to mark its chief progress. One of the earliest evils that flowed from this immoderate attachment to philosophy, was the violence to which it gave rise in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. For, whereas, the Christians had, from a very early period, imbibed the notion that under the words, laws, and facts, recorded in the sacred volume, there is a latent sense concealed, an opinion which they appear to have derived from the Jews, no sooner did this passion for philosophizing take possession of their minds, than they began with wonderful subtilty to press the Scriptures into their service, in support of all such principles and maxims as appeared to them consonant to reason; and at the same time most wretchedly to pervert and twist every part of those divine oracles which opposed itself to their philosophical tenets or notions. The greatest proficients in this pernicious practice were those Egyptian teachers who first directed the attention of the Christians towards philosophy, namely, Pantænus and Clement."—*Cent. 2, sec. 33.*

In another place (Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 25, note 2) Mosheim speaks of Clement as blind and misguided. Thus:—

"There can be no question, however, but that Clement is to be ranked amongst the first and principal Christian defenders and teachers of philosophic science; indeed that he may even be placed at the head of those who devoted themselves to the cultivation of philosophy with an ardor that knew no bounds, and were so blind and misguided as to engage in the hopeless attempt of producing an ac-

commodation between the principles of philosophic science and those of the Christian religion. He himself expressly tells us in his 'Stromata,' that he would not hand down Christian truth pure and unmixed, but 'associated with, or rather veiled by, and shrouded under, the precepts of philosophy.' For, according to him, the rudiments or seeds of celestial wisdom communicated by Christ to the world, lay hid in the philosophy of the Greeks, after the same manner as the esculent part of a nut lies concealed within a shell. . . . For he appears to have been firmly persuaded that the essence of the Greek philosophy was sound, wholesome, and salutary. In fact, that it was perfectly consonant to the spirit of Christian wisdom, but that it was compassed about and veiled from immediate observation by a cloud of superstition and idle fictions, just in the same way as the kernel of a nut is concealed by the shell, and that we should, therefore, make it our business industriously to penetrate this exterior covering, so as to discover the true relationship between human and divine wisdom. The origin of the Greek philosophy he, without scruple, attributes to the Deity himself."

Surely such an one cannot be a safe man to follow, for all the ideas which he advances will be pagan ideas, and whoever accepts them as representatives of Christianity, will have a paganized Christianity, or a Christianized paganism, whichever one chooses to call it. The thoughtful reader can easily picture from the above quotation, how the papacy (which has been aptly called "paganism baptized") arose upon the teaching of the Fathers. But teaching from which the papacy was developed, is not the teaching from which pure Christianity can be developed. The same fountain cannot send forth both sweet water and bitter.

Killen's idea of Clement as an expositor of Scripture is expressed in the following paragraph:—

"Clement, as is apparent from his writings, was extensively acquainted with profane literature. But he formed quite too high an estimate of the value of the heathen philosophy, whilst he allegorized Scripture in a way as dangerous as it was absurd. By the serpent which deceived Eve, according to Clement, '*pleasure*, an earthly vice which creeps upon the belly, is allegorically represented.' Moses, speaking allegorically, if we may believe this writer, called the divine wisdom *the tree of life* planted in paradise; by which paradise we may understand the world, in which all the works of creation were called into being. He even interprets the ten commandments allegorically. Thus, by *adultery*, he understands a departure from the true knowledge of the Most High, and by *murder*, a violation of the truth respecting God and his eternal existence. It is easy to see how Scripture, by such a system of interpretation, might be tortured into a witness for any extravagance."—*Ancient Church, part 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraph 15.*

And Archdeacon Farrar shows in the following paragraph, that although Clement possessed great learning, he lacked the most essential wisdom—that of the Bible:—

"His attitude towards the inspired writings is that of his age. He makes room for legends even in the New Testament story. His quotations are loose and paraphrastic, and are sometimes attributed to a wrong author. He quotes verses which have no existence. He refers to apocryphal writings as though they were inspired. He attributes the book of Wisdom to Solomon, and the book of Baruch to Jeremiah. He quotes even the 'Revelation' and 'Preaching' of Peter, as well as the 'Epistle of Barnabas' and the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' as having scriptural authority. He believes in the miraculous inspiration of the Septuagint, the Sibyl, and Hystaspes, and he calls Plato 'all but an evangelical prophet.'"—*History of Interpretation, p. 184.*

With this much by way of preliminary, we may intro-

duce our readers to Clement himself, as he appears in his own writings.

The first quotation which we will give is from "The Instructor," a series of homilies covering almost every subject. The translator, Rev. William Wilson, ranks it "among the most valuable remains of Christian antiquity;" and it cannot be denied that there are some good things in it. There are some points concerning hygiene and good manners that would not be out of place in any book intended as a manual for the young,—just such things as we may suppose were taught to the children of all educated and refined heathen of ancient times. But even in "The Instructor" the good things are intermingled with so much that is utterly destitute of sense, that one minute the reader will think that Clement was a wise instructor of youth, and the next will be ready to aver that he was a fool. In the first chapter of book 2 he gives the following as a reason why people should stint themselves in the quantity of food which they eat:—

"And they say that the bodies of children, when shooting up to their height, are made to grow right by deficiency in nourishment. For then the spirit, which pervades the body in order to its growth, is not checked by abundance of food obstructing the freedom of its course."

The proprietor of Dotheboy's Hall would have called that sound gospel, but sensible people know that temperate, healthful living is not starvation.

The following, from the same chapter, is a good sample of the way in which he mixes with that which is sensible, the allegorical, the fanciful, and the nonsensical:—

"From all slavish habits and excess we must abstain, and touch what is set before us in a decorous way; keeping the hand and couch and chin free of stains; preserving the grace of the countenance undisturbed, and committing no indecorum in the act of swallowing; but stretching out the hand at intervals in an orderly manner. We must guard against speaking anything while eating; for the voice becomes disagreeable and inarticulate when it is confined by full jaws; and the tongue, pressed by the food and impeded in its natural energy, gives forth a compressed utterance. Nor is it suitable to eat and drink simultaneously. For it is the very extreme of intemperance to confound the times whose uses are discordant. And 'whether ye eat or drink, do all in the glory of God,' aiming after true frugality, which the Lord also seems to me to have hinted at when he blessed the loaves and cooked fishes with which he feasted the disciples, introducing a beautiful example of simple food. That fish then which, at the command of the Lord, Peter caught, points to digestible and God-given and moderate food. And by those who rise from the water to the bait of righteousness, he admonishes us to take away luxury and avarice, as the coin from the fish; in order that he might displace vainglory; and by giving the stater to the tax-gatherers, and 'rendering to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's,' might preserve 'to God the things which are God's.' The stater is capable of other explanations not unknown to us, but the present is not a suitable occasion for their treatment. Let the mention we make for our present purpose suffice, as it is not unsuitable to the flowers of the Word; and we have often done this, drawing to the urgent point of the question the most beneficial fountain, in order to water those who have been planted by the Word."

From the above it will be seen that he had a wonderful gift of imagination, which he exercised freely in the interpretation of Scripture. As he intimates, this is only

a small portion of the fancies that he has on the simple matter of Peter's catching a fish. But we shall note still greater manifestations of his genius. Speaking of the miracle of turning water into wine, he says of Christ:—

"He gave life to the watery element of the meaning of the law, filling with his blood the doer of it who is of Adam, that is, the whole world; supplying piety with drink from the vine of truth, the mixture of the old law and of the new word, in order to the fulfillment of the predestined time."—*The Instructor, book 2, chap. 2.*

This is simply a collection of words without sense. What edification sensible people can find in such stuff is a mystery. And what we have quoted might be multiplied many times, if we had space to give long extracts.

The "Stromata," or "Miscellanies," is, as its title indicates, of a miscellaneous character. According to Eusebius, the full title was, "Titus Flavius Clement's Miscellaneous Collections of Speculative Notes, Bearing upon the True Philosophy." Says the translator in his introduction:—

"The aim of the work, in accordance with this title, is, in opposition to gnosticism, to furnish the material for the construction of a true gnosis, a Christian philosophy, on the basis of faith, and to lead on to this higher knowledge those who, by the discipline of the *Pædagogus* ["The Instructor"], had been trained for it. . . . . He describes philosophy as a divinely ordered preparation of the Greeks for faith in Christ, as the law was for the Hebrews; and shows the necessity and value of literature and philosophic culture for the attainment of true Christian knowledge."

Again the translator says:—

"Clement's quotations from Scripture are made from the Septuagint version, often inaccurately from memory,

sometimes from a different text from what we possess, often with verbal adaptations; and not rarely different texts are blended together."

And it is to such a mixture as this,—of conjectural Scripture "arranged" and "adapted" according to his own ideas, and the speculations of heathen philosophy,—that people are being directed for their knowledge of Christianity. The man who gets his light from such a fog bank is truly to be pitied.

But Bishop Coxe is willing to vouch for the orthodoxy of Clement. In a foot-note to the paragraph last quoted, after speaking of the supposition of Photius, that "one of the works of Clement (now lost) contained many things unworthy of his orthodoxy and piety," he says:—

"But his great repute in the Catholic Church after his decease, is sufficient to place his character far above all suspicions of his having ever swerved from the 'faith of the church.'"

Ah, yes; just so; perhaps an apology will be expected from those who have spoken slightingly of his value as a teacher of Christianity. Who could doubt the orthodoxy of a man who has always been held in high repute by the Catholic Church? This is all the indorsement that Clement really has. Let Protestants change their name before they presume to quote Clement of Alexandria as authority for anything.

The translators in their introductory note say further of Clement's writings:—

"Of course there is throughout plenty of false science, and frivolous and fanciful speculation."

Indeed there is, and without further ado we will let our readers judge for themselves. The heading of the

sixth chapter of book 5 is, "The Mystic Meaning of the Tabernacle and its Furniture," and the following is part of what he gives on that subject:—

"Again, there is the veil of the entrance into the holy of holies. Four pillars there are, the sign of the sacred tetrad of the ancient covenants. Further, the mystic name of four letters which was affixed to those alone to whom the adytum was accessible is called Jave, which is interpreted, 'who is and shall be.' The name of God, too, among the Greeks contains four letters.

"Now the Lord, having come alone into the intellectual world, enters by his sufferings, introduced into the knowledge of the ineffable, ascending above every name which is known by sound. The lamp, too, was placed to the south of the altar of incense; and by it were shown the motions of the seven planets, that perform their revolutions toward the south. For three branches rose on either side of the lamp, and lights on them; since also the sun, like the lamp, set in the midst of all the planets, dispenses with a kind of divine music the light to those above and to those below."

After the reader has pondered on the above to his heart's content, he may proceed to this, which is from the same chapter:—

"North of the altar of incense was placed a table, on which there was 'the exhibition of the loaves;' for the most nourishing of the winds are those of the north. And thus are signified certain seats of churches conspiring so as to form one body and one assemblage.

"And the things recorded of the sacred ark signify the properties of the world of thought, which is hidden and closed to the many.

"And those golden figures, each of them with six wings, signify either the two bears, as some will have it, or rather the two hemispheres. And the name cherubim meant 'much knowledge.' But both together have

twelve wings, and by the zodiac and time which moves on it, point out the world of sense."

And when the reader has thoroughly assimilated all the instruction conveyed in this, he may revel in the following wonderful elucidation of the "deep things" of the Bible:—

"But I think it better to regard the ark, so called from the Hebrew word *Thebotha*, as signifying something else. It is interpreted, *one instead of one in all places.* Whether, then, it is the eighth region and the world of thought, or God, all-embracing, and without shape, and invisible, that is indicated, we may for the present defer saying. But it signifies the repose which dwells with the adoring spirits, which are meant by the cherubim.

"For he who prohibited the making of a graven image, would never himself have made an image in the likeness of holy things. Nor is there at all any composite thing, and creature endowed with sensation, of the sort in heaven. But the face is a symbol of the rational soul, and the wings are the lofty ministers and energies of powers right and left; and the voice is delightsome glory in ceaseless contemplation. Let it suffice that the mystic interpretation has advanced so far.

"Now the high priest's robe is the symbol of the world of sense. The seven planets are represented by the five stones and the two carbuncles, for Saturn and the moon. The former is southern, and moist, and earthy, and heavy; the latter ærial, whence she is called by some Artemis, as if Aerotomos (cutting the air); and the air is cloudy. And co-operating as they did in the production of things here below, those that by divine providence are set over the planets are rightly represented as placed on the breast and shoulders; and by them was the work of creation, the first week. And the breast is the seat of the heart and soul."

"The twelve stones, set in four rows on the breast, describe for us the circle of the zodiac, in the four changes of the year."

Some may think that this is enough; but we now have to present the most valuable part of the whole book,—the part which so many are anxiously longing to have in convenient form for general circulation, in order to settle the minds of doubters. It is what Clement has to say concerning the observance of Sunday. In book 5, chapter 14 of the "Stromata," he says:—

"And the Lord's day Plato prophetically speaks of in the tenth book of the 'Republic,' in these words: 'And when seven days have passed to each of them in the meadow, on the eighth day they are to set out and arrive in four days.' By the meadow is to be understood the fixed sphere, as being a mild and genial spot, and the locality of the pious; and by the seven days each motion of the seven planets, and the whole practical art which speeds to the end of rest. But after the wandering orbs the journey leads to Heaven, that is, to the eighth motion and day. And he says that souls are gone on the fourth day, pointing out the passage through the four elements. But the seventh day is recognized as sacred, not by the Hebrews only, but also by the Greeks; according to which the whole world of all animals and planets revolve."

On this Bishop Coxe has the following in a foot-note:—

"The bearing of this passage on questions of Sabbatical and dominical observances, needs only to be indicated."

No doubt; but we cannot help wishing that the good bishop had taken the trouble to indicate the bearing that it has on those questions, for we don't see how common people are going to find out for themselves. Truly the Sunday institution must be reduced to desperate straits, when it has to depend in any measure upon a "prophecy" uttered by a heathen philosopher, especially when neither that "prophecy" nor its interpretation by the speculative Clement contains any mention of Sunday.

Again, in his exposition of the ten commandments, Clement says:—

"And the fourth word is that which intimates that the world was created by God, and that he gave us the seventh day as a rest, on account of the trouble that there is in life. For God is incapable of weariness, and suffering, and want. But we who bear flesh need rest. The seventh day, therefore, is proclaimed a rest—abstraction from ills—preparing for the Primal Day, our true rest; which, in truth, is the first creation of light, in which all things are viewed and possessed. From this day the first wisdom and knowledge illuminate us. For the light of truth—a light true, casting no shadow, is the Spirit of God indivisibly divided to all, who are sanctified by faith, holding the place of a luminary, in order to the knowledge of real existences. By following him, therefore, through our whole life, we become impassible; and this is to rest."—*Stromata, book 6, chap. 16.*

It really makes no difference what Clement says upon any subject, but for the benefit of those who imagine that in the above he throws his feeble influence in favor of Sunday observance, we quote the following from the very next paragraph:—

"Having reached this point, we must mention these things by the way; since the discourse has turned on the seventh and the eighth. For the eighth may possibly turn out to be properly the seventh, and the seventh manifestly the sixth, and the latter properly the Sabbath, and the seventh a day of work. For the creation of the world was concluded in six days."

It will be seen that by this hocus-pocus, Clement, if his jumble of words can be said to have any meaning, makes out that the seventh day is really the true Sabbath. The statement seems to be that that which some call "the eighth day," namely Sunday, may be the seventh day,

and a day of work, and that the real seventh day may be the sixth, and the true Sabbath, as it really is. That is what his words mean, if they mean anything, which we greatly doubt. If anyone, however, thinks that a different meaning should be attached to these words, we shall not dispute with him, for it is one of those passages so characteristic of the Fathers, to which each individual may attach his own meaning, and all be equally correct.

There is just one more reference in Clement's writings to the "Lord's day," and it is on this wise:—

"He [the gnostic], in fulfillment of the precept, according to the gospel, keeps the Lord's day, when he abandons an evil disposition, and assumes that of the gnostic, glorifying the Lord's resurrection in himself. Further, also, when he has received the comprehension of scientific speculation, he deems that he sees the Lord, directing his eyes towards things invisible, although he seems to look on what he does not wish to look on."—*Id., book 7, chap. 12.*

Bishop Coxe thinks that the original of Clement's argument seems to imply that he is here speaking of the Paschal festival, instead of a weekly rest day. It makes little difference. Those who wish to count it as evidence in favor of Sunday-keeping are welcome to do so, but they must also accept the following heathen interpretation of Scripture:—

"Wherefore the Lord preached the gospel to those in *hades*. Accordingly the Scripture says, '*Hades* says to Destruction, we have not seen his form, but we have heard his voice.' It is not plainly the place, which, the words above say, heard the voice, but those who have been put in *hades* and have abandoned themselves to destruction, as persons who have thrown themselves voluntarily from a ship into the sea. They, then, are

those that hear the divine power and voice. For who in his senses can suppose the souls of the righteous and those of sinners in the same condemnation, charging Providence with injustice?

"But how? Do not (the Scriptures) show that the Lord preached the gospel to those that perished in the flood, or rather had been chained, and to those kept (in ward and guard)? And it has been shown also, in the second book of the 'Stromata,' that the apostles, following the Lord, preached the gospel to those in *hades*. For it was requisite, in my opinion, that as here, so also there, the best of the disciples should be imitators of the Master; so that he should bring to repentance those belonging to the Hebrews, and they the Gentiles; that is, those that had lived in righteousness according to the law and philosophy, who had ended life not perfectly, but sinfully. For it was suitable to the divine administration, that those possessed of greater worth in righteousness, and whose life had been pre-eminent, on repenting of their transgressions, though found in another place, yet being confessedly of the number of the people of God Almighty, should be saved, each one according to his individual knowledge." —*Id., book 6, chap. 6.*

From this we see that the "new theology" of a probation after death is very old. There is no doubt but that many will be rejoiced to find in Clement such testimony for the "larger hope;" but let those who feel inclined to accept such teaching, make up their mind to accept also that to which it leads, namely, purgatory and prayers and masses for the dead. For if the dead are on probation, it needs no argument to show that they should be prayed for. This doctrine has been the means of bringing a vast amount of treasure into the Roman Catholic Church, and it is not to be wondered at that that church has always held Clement in so great repute.

We have just one more "excellent piece of knowledge" to present from the writings of Clement. It is very long, but it is so good an example of the "false science, and frivolous and fanciful speculation," of which the translator rightly says there is a "plenty" throughout all Clement's writings, that we give it. If it were omitted, the reader could not form a correct idea of the beauty and clearness of Clement's style, and his value as a Christian interpreter. It is chapter 11 of book 6 of the "Stromata," and is entitled, "The Mystical Meanings in the Proportions of Numbers, Geometrical Ratios, and Music:"—

"As then in astronomy we have Abraham as an instance, so also in arithmetic we have the same Abraham. 'For, hearing that Lot was taken captive, and having numbered his own servants, born in his house, 318 (τιη'),' he defeats a very great number of the enemy.

"They say, then, that the character representing 300 is, as to shape, the type of the Lord's sign, and that the *Iota* and the *Eta* indicate the Saviour's name; that it was indicated, accordingly, that Abraham's domestics were in salvation, who having fled to the sign and the name became lords of the captives, and of the very many unbelieving nations that followed them.

"Now the number 300 is, 3 by 100. Ten is allowed to be the perfect number. And 8 is the first cube, which is equality in all the dimensions—length, breadth, depth. 'The days of men shall be,' it is said, '120 (ρκ) years.' And the sum is made up of the numbers from 1 to 15 added together. And the moon at 15 days is full.

"On another principle, 120 is a triangular number, and consists of the equality of the number 64 (which consists of eight of the odd numbers beginning with unity), the addition of which (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15) in succession generate squares; and of the inequality of the number 56, consisting of seven of the even numbers beginning with 2 (2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14), which produce the numbers that are not squares.

"Again, according to another way of indicating, the number 120 consists of four numbers—of one triangle, 15; of another, a square, 25; of a third, a pentagon, 35; and of a fourth, a hexagon, 45. The five is taken according to the same ratio in each mode. For in triangular numbers, from the unit 5 comes 15; and in squares, 25; and of those in succession, proportionally. Now 25, which is the number 5 from unity, is said to be the symbol of the Levitical tribe, and the number 35 depends also on the arithmetic, geometric, and harmonic scale of doubles—6, 8, 9, 12; the addition of which makes 35. In these days, the Jews say that seven months' children are formed. And the number 45 depends on the scale of triples—6, 9, 12, 18—the addition of which makes 45; and similarly, in these days they say that nine months' children are formed.

"Such, then, is the style of the example in arithmetic. And let the testimony of geometry be the tabernacle that was constructed, and the ark that was fashioned,—constructed in most regular proportions, and through divine ideas, by the gift of understanding, which leads us from things of sense to intellectual objects, or rather from these to holy things, and to the holy of holies. For the squares of wood indicate that the square form, producing right angles, pervades all, and points out security. And the length of the structure was three hundred cubits, and the breadth fifty, and the height thirty; and above, the ark ends in a cubit, narrowing to a cubit from the broad base like a pyramid, the symbol of those who are purified and tested by fire. And this geometrical proportion has a place, for the transport of those holy abodes, whose differences are indicated by the differences of the numbers set down below.

"And the numbers introduced are sixfold, as three hundred is six times fifty; and tenfold, as three hundred is ten times thirty; and containing one and two-thirds (ἐπιδίμοιροι), for fifty is one and two-thirds of thirty.

"Now there are some who say three hundred cubits

are the symbol of the Lord's sign; and fifty, of hope and of the remission given at Pentecost; and thirty, or as in some, twelve, they say points out the preaching (of the gospel); because the Lord preached in his thirtieth year; and the apostles were twelve. And the structure's terminating in a cubit is the symbol of the advancement of the righteous to oneness and to 'the unity of the faith.'

"And the table which was in the temple was six cubits; and its four feet were about a cubit and a half.

"They add, then, the twelve cubits, agreeably to the revolution of the twelve months, in the annual circle, during which the earth produces and matures all things; adapting itself to the four seasons. And the table, in my opinion, exhibits the image of the earth, supported as it is on four feet, summer, autumn, spring, winter, by which the year travels. Wherefore also it is said that the table has 'wavy chains;' either because the universe revolves in the circuits of the times, or perhaps it indicated the earth surrounded with ocean's tide."

And this is the man of whom Bishop Coxe says that "after Justin and Irenæus, he is to be reckoned the founder of Christian literature." His writings are said to introduce us "to a new stage of the church's progress." Heaven save the mark! If this be "progress," let us have retrogression. It does indeed show rapid progress toward the sinks and quagmires of Romanism; and only he who spurns all such "Christian literature" as poison, and returns to the simple truths of the gospel, as unfolded by Christ and his apostles, can hope to walk in the light. But no one who quotes Clement in behalf of Sunday-keeping, can consistently refuse to accept all the heresy and trash which Clement wrote.

In the following explanation we find Rome's authority for withholding the Bible from the common people:—

"For many reasons, then, the Scriptures hide the sense. First, that we may become inquisitive, and be ever on the watch for the discovery of the words of salvation. Then it was not suitable for all to understand, so that they might not receive harm in consequence of taking in another sense the things declared for salvation by the Holy Spirit."—*Id., chap. 15.*

That is to say, that the Scriptures are veiled in obscurity, because people would be apt to misunderstand them if they were written in simple language! And Clement has the sublime egotism to suppose that his insane ravings are an exposition of the "veiled" Scriptures! Worse than all, scores and hundreds of professed Protestant ministers are willing to concede his claim.

Again we say, Let no one who is not willing to write himself down a Roman Catholic, presume to quote with approval the writings of Clement of Alexandria.

CHAPTER XII.

TERTULLIAN.

If I were asked which of the so-called Christian Fathers is, in my judgment, the best, I should say, Tertullian. He seems to have clearer ideas of things, and he is certainly the most intelligible. Although he is as unorthodox as any of the Fathers, one can understand his heresy, and that is more than can be said of the others. Yet notwithstanding his clearness as compared with most of the other Fathers, Killen could truthfully say of him:—

"The extant productions of this writer are numerous; and, if rendered into our language, would form a very portly volume. But though several parts of them have found translators, the whole have never yet appeared in English; and, of some pieces, the most accomplished scholar would scarcely undertake to furnish at once a literal and an intelligible version. His style is harsh, his transitions are abrupt, and his innuendoes and allusions most perplexing. He must have been a man of very bilious temperament, who could scarcely distinguish a theological opponent from a personal enemy; for he pours forth upon those who differ from him whole torrents of sarcasm and invective. His strong passion, acting upon a fervid imagination, completely overpowered his judgment; and hence he deals so largely in exaggeration, that, as to many matters of fact, we cannot safely depend upon his testimony. His tone is dictatorial and dogmatic; and, though we cannot doubt his piety, we must feel that his spirit is somewhat repulsive and ungenial. Whilst he was sadly deficient in sagacity, he

was very much the creature of impulse; and thus it was that he was so superstitious, so bigoted, and so choleric." —*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraph 11.*

Tertullian exhibits also the most knowledge of Scripture, although, as Farrar says, he "practically makes Scripture say exactly what he himself chooses." So that after all that may be said in his favor, he cannot be depended upon to any extent whatever as an expositor of Scripture. Indeed, it is a truth that the "best" of the Fathers are the worst. Whoever reads them dispassionately, without his judgment warped by prejudice or a determination to find support for some pet theory, will, as a general thing, conclude that each one is the worst of all.

Tertullian was born at Carthage, about A. D. 160. He is supposed to have been converted from heathenism about the year 200 A. D., and he was afterward ordained a presbyter of the church in Carthage. He was a very prolific writer, and although there are many good things in his writings, they are the greatest stronghold of Roman Catholicism. The "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says that his writings form the "foundation of Latin theology." That means that they form the foundation of Roman Catholic theology. This statement alone should make Protestants resolve to have nothing to do with him. For it is certain that no pure Christianity can be found in writings which form the foundation of Roman Catholicism. We propose to give our readers a chance to judge for themselves of the truth of the statement that Tertullian's writings were largely instrumental in developing the growth of that "mystery of iniquity" which had begun to work in the days of Paul, and

which resulted in "that man of sin, the son of perdition,"—the antichristian papacy. But first we shall see how he is regarded even by those who are willing to quote from him in support of pet theories which cannot be sustained by the Bible.

Archdeacon Farrar says of him:—

"The eloquent, fiery, uncompromising African practically makes Scripture say exactly what he himself chooses." "Insisting on the verse, 'God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the strong,' he adopted the paradox, *Credo quia absurdum est* [I believe that which is absurd], and the wild conclusion that the more repugnant to sound reason a statement was, it ought so much the more to be deemed worthy of God."—*History of Interpretation, pp. 178, 179, 180.*

Following is the brief biography of Tertullian given by Mosheim in his "Ecclesiastical History:"—

"In the Latin language, scarcely any writer of this century elucidated or defended the Christian religion, except Tertullian. He was at first a jurisconsult, then a presbyter at Carthage, and at last a follower of Montanus. We have various short works of his, which aim either to explain and defend the truth, or to excite piety. Which were the greatest, his excellencies or his defects, it is difficult to say. He possessed great genius; but it was wild and unchastened. His piety was active and fervent; but likewise gloomy and austere. He had much learning and knowledge; but lacked discretion and judgment; he was more acute than solid."—*Book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 5.*

Those who read much about Tertullian will find frequent reference to his Montanism, and therefore it may not be amiss in this introduction to learn something of the teachings of Montanus, whose follower Tertullian became. The following is from Killen's "Ancient Church:"—

"Shortly after the middle of the second century the church began to be troubled by a heresy in some respects very different from gnosticism. At that time the persecuting spirit displayed by Marcus Aurelius filled the Christians throughout the empire with alarm, and those of them who were given to despondency began to entertain the most gloomy anticipations. An individual, named Montanus, who laid claim to prophetic endowments now appeared in a village on the borders of Phrygia; and though he seems to have possessed a rather mean capacity, his discipline was so suited to the taste of many, and the predictions which he uttered so accorded with prevailing apprehensions, that he soon created a deep impression. When he first came forward in the character of a divine instructor, he had been recently converted to Christianity; and he seems to have strangely misapprehended the nature of the gospel. When he delivered his pretended communications from Heaven, he is said to have wrought himself up into a state of frenzied excitement. His countrymen, who had been accustomed to witness the ecstasies of the priests of Bacchus and Cybele, saw proofs of a divine impulse in his bodily contortions; and some of them at once acknowledged his extraordinary mission. By means of two wealthy female associates, named Priscilla and Maximilla, who also professed to utter prophecies, Montanus was enabled rapidly to extend his influence. His fame spread abroad on all sides; and, in a few years, he had followers in Europe and in Africa, as well as in Asia.

"It cannot be said that this heresiarch attempted to overturn the creed of the church. He was neither a profound thinker nor a logical reasoner; and he certainly had not maturely studied the science of theology. But he possessed an ardent temperament, and he seems to have mistaken the suggestions of his own fanaticism for the dictates of inspiration. The doctrine of the personal reign of Christ during the millennium appears to have formed a prominent topic in his ministrations. He main-

tained that the discipline of the church had been left incomplete by the apostles, and that he was empowered to supply a better code of regulations. According to some he proclaimed himself the *Paraclete;* but, if so, he most grievously belied his assumed name, for his system was far better fitted to induce despondency than to inspire comfort. All his precepts were conceived in the sour and contracted spirit of mere ritualism. He insisted upon long fasts; he condemned second marriages; he inveighed against all who endeavored to save themselves by flight in times of persecution; and he asserted that such as had once been guilty of any heinous transgression should never again be admitted to ecclesiastical fellowship. Whilst he promulgated this stern discipline, he at the same time delivered the most dismal predictions, announcing, among other things, the speedy catastrophe of the Roman Empire. He also gave out that the Phrygian village where he ministered was to become the New Jerusalem of renovated Christianity."—*Period 2, sec. 2, chap. 4, paragraphs 8, 9.*

When we come to examine the writings of Tertullian, we shall find that he was a worthy disciple of such a master, and although his apologists claim that his writings were mostly completed before he became a Montanist, there is very little if any difference in the spirit of his earlier and his later productions; so that we are forced to conclude that he became a Montanist simply because he was such in reality from the beginning of his career. The theology of Montanus found in Tertullian congenial soil.

There can be no one who holds the Fathers in higher esteem than does Bishop Coxe, yet in his introduction to the "Pastor of Hermas," he speaks of Tertullian as,—

"The great founder of 'Latin Christianity,' whose very ashes breathed contagion into the life of such as handled

his relics with affection, save only those, who, like Cyprian, were gifted with a character as strong as his own. The genius of Tertullian inspired his very insanity with power, and, to the discipline of the Latin churches, he communicated something of the rigor of Montanism, with the natural reactionary relaxation of morals in actual life. Of this, we shall learn enough when we come to read the fascinating pages of that splendid but infatuated author."

Surely such an author ought to be put into perpetual quarantine. If it had been done centuries ago, it would have saved Protestantism to a great extent from becoming tainted with his Roman Catholic contagion; for no Father has done more than he to establish the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed, as in the case of Clement of Alexandria, Bishop Coxe seems exceedingly anxious to vindicate Tertullian from the charge of being recreant to the Catholic faith. In his introduction to Tertullian's writings he says:—

"Let us reflect that St. Bernard and after him the schoolmen, whom we so deservedly honor, separated themselves far more absolutely than ever Tertullian did from the orthodoxy of primitive Christendom. The schism which withdrew the West from communion with the original seats of Christendom and from Nicene Catholicity, was formidable beyond all expression, in comparison with Tertullian's entanglements with a delusion which the see of Rome itself had momentarily patronized. . . . . To Döllinger, with the 'Old Catholic' remnant only, is left the right to name the Montanists heretics, or to upbraid Tertullian as a lapser from Catholicity."

That is to say that Tertullian did not backslide from Catholicism nearly so far as some other eminent Catholics did. Let the reader bear in mind that the highest recommendation that Tertullian's champion can give him

LIBRARY OF THE

is that he never strayed very far from the Roman Catholic faith. There are still many Protestants with whom such a recommendation would have little weight, except in turning them against him.

In keeping with the quotation, which charges Tertullian with insanity, is the statement of the *Western Churchman* (Denver, Col.), which, in an article entitled, "The Right to Administer the Sacraments" (vol. 1, No. 23), called Tertullian "this zealous, brilliant, illogical, unstable Father." Not a very good foundation to build on, is it?

We have already read that Tertullian was the founder of Latin (Roman Catholic) theology; the following quotations name some of the peculiar features of Catholicism which were derived from him. Killen says:—

"Tertullian flourished at a period when ecclesiastical usurpation was beginning to produce some of its bitter fruits, and when religion was rapidly degenerating from its primitive purity. His works, which treat of a great variety of topics interesting to the Christian student, throw immense light on the state of the church in his generation. . . . But the way of salvation by faith seems to have been very indistinctly apprehended by him, so that he cannot be safely trusted as a theologian. He had evidently no clear conception of the place which works ought to occupy according to the scheme of the gospel; and hence he sometimes speaks as if pardon could be purchased by penance, by fasting, or by martyrdom."—*Period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraph 13.*

Here is the cloven foot of antichrist. Salvation by works is the doctrine which puts man on a level with Jesus Christ, and so crowds Christ out altogether. Without this idea, Roman Catholicism could not exist. It is the sand bank upon which that church is built. Notice

that while Tertullian's writings are said to throw great light on the state of the church in his generation, it is declared to be a generation when religion was rapidly degenerating from its primitive purity. So while his writings may be interesting as showing the degree of degeneration which the church had reached within less than two hundred years after the days of the apostles, they are worth nothing for any other purpose. And, indeed, we cannot always depend upon them for a knowledge of the customs of the church in his days, for, as we have already quoted from Dr. Killen, "he deals so largely in exaggeration that, as to many matters of fact, we cannot safely depend upon his testimony."

The following from Neander, as to Tertullian's "warm, ungoverned imagination," corroborates the above:—

"Tertullian is a writer of peculiar importance, both as the first representative of the theological character of the North African Church, and as the representative of the Montanistic opinions. He was a man of ardent mind, warm disposition, and deeply serious character, accustomed to give himself up with all his soul and strength to the object of his love, and haughtily to reject all which was uncongenial to that object. He had a fund of great and multifarious knowledge, but it was confusedly heaped up in his mind, without scientific arrangement. His depth of thought was not united with logical clearness and judgment; a warm, ungoverned imagination, that dwelt in sensuous images, was his ruling power. His impetuous and haughty disposition, and his early education as an advocate or a rhetorician, were prone to carry him, especially in controversy, to rhetorical exaggerations." —*Rose's Neander, sec. 5, edition of 1843, pp. 424, 425.*

It is very evident, therefore, that Tertullian's testimony will have to be regarded with suspicion.

The following from Dr. Schaff sets Tertullian forth as a father of monkery and the Roman Catholic distinction between mortal and venial sins:—

"The heathen gnostic principle of separation from the world and from the body as a means of self-redemption, after being theoretically exterminated, stole into the church by a back door of practice, directly in face of the Christian doctrine of the high destiny of the body, and perfect redemption through Christ.

"The Alexandrian Fathers first furnished a theoretical basis for this asceticism, in the distinction, suggested even by the pastor Hermæ, of a lower and a higher morality; a distinction, which, like that introduced at the same period by Tertullian, of mortal and venial sins, gave rise to many practical errors, and favored both mortal laxity and ascetic extravagance."—*Church History, vol. 1, sec. 94.*

Tertullian also stands as sponsor, or one of the sponsors, for the Roman Catholic doctrine of prayers to the dead. This, as the reader doubtless well knows, was simply the baptized form of the pagan custom of making gods of departed heroes. Bingham (Antiquities of the Christian Church, book 1, chap. 4) says:—

"Tertullian adds to these [*i. e.*, the martyrs] the name of *chari Dei*, the favorites of Heaven; because their prayers and intercessions were powerful with God, to obtain pardon for others, that should address Heaven by them. Therefore, in his instructions to the penitents, he bids them, *charis Dei adgeniculari*, fall down at the feet of these favorites, and commend their suit to all the brethren, desiring them to intercede with God for them."

And Killen, speaking of the exposition of Matt. 16: 16–18, which makes Peter the head of the church, says:—

"Tertullian and Cyprian, in the third century the two

most eminent Fathers of the West, countenanced the exposition; and though both these writers were lamentably deficient in critical sagacity, men of inferior standing were slow to impugn the verdict of such champions of the faith."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 1, chap. 5, paragraph 19.*

That was the way that the papacy established itself; certain men came to be looked upon as *authorities*, and the people, leaving the plain declarations of the Bible, blindly accepted their *dictum*. The bishops, many of whom were pagan philosophers when chosen to preside over the churches, came very naturally to occupy this position, and the way was thus paved for the most powerful bishop to become pope, exercising lordship over men's consciences.

But the reader is doubtless anxious to be entertained with some of Tertullian's peculiarities, fresh from the original source, and so he shall now be allowed to speak for himself. As a good example of his fiery impetuosity, which could lead him to rejoice in anticipation of witnessing the sufferings of the lost, we quote from his treatise, "The Shows." After having spoken of the wickedness of the shows, which many professed Christians were very fond of attending, he likens (chap. 30) the Judgment-day to a vast show in which the actors will be the illustrious men of earth, and he a delighted spectator:—

"How vast a spectacle then bursts upon the eye! What there excites my admiration? what my derision? Which sight gives me joy? which rouses me to exultation?—as I see so many illustrious monarchs, whose reception into the heavens was publicly announced, groaning now in the lowest darkness with great Jove himself,

and those, too, who bore witness of their exultation; governors of provinces, too, who persecuted the Christian name, in fires more fierce than those with which in the days of their pride they raged against the followers of Christ. What world's wise men besides, the very philosophers, in fact, who taught their followers that God had no concern in aught that is sublunary, and were wont to assure them that either they had no souls, or that they would never return to the bodies which at death they had left, now covered with shame before the poor deluded ones, as one fire consumes them! Poets also, trembling not before the judgment-seat of Rhadamanthus or Minos, but of the unexpected Christ! I shall have a better opportunity then of hearing the tragedians, louder-voiced in their own calamity; of viewing the play-actors, much more 'dissolute' in the dissolving flame, of looking upon the charioteer, all glowing in his chariot of fire; of beholding the wrestlers, not in their gymnasia, but tossing in the fiery billows."

This certainly does not reveal Tertullian in a very amiable aspect.

Since Turtullian is the Father who, perhaps to a greater extent than any other, is depended on for authority to uphold Sunday observance, we will at the outset examine what he has to say on that subject. It may not be amiss, however, again to remind the reader that Tertullian is the great champion of Roman Catholicism, and to recall the statements already quoted, that his "warm, ungoverned imagination," acted upon by "strong passion," "completely overpowered his judgment," and that "he deals so largely in exaggeration that, as to many matters of fact, we cannot safely depend upon his testimony." This being the case, we are perfectly willing that Sunday advocates should have the full benefit of Tertullian's testimony, always remembering that even

though it could be proved that Sunday was observed in Tertullian's time, that would not connect the day with the Bible, but only with the custom of a people only half Christian at best.

In his "Apology" (chap. 16), an address written to the rulers and magistrates of the empire, he says:—

"Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god. We shall be counted Persians perhaps, though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, having himself everywhere in his own disk. The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer. But you, many of you, also under pretense sometimes of worshiping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sun-day to rejoicing, from a far different reason than Sun-worship, we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury, though they too go far away from Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant."

Here he admits that there was considerable reason in the charge that he, and Christians of his sort, worshiped the sun. The Bible student who reads Tertullian's declaration that they worshiped toward the east, and devoted the Sunday to rejoicing, will doubtless be reminded of the passage in Ezekiel, where the prophet, after being shown the women "weeping for Tammuz"—the Babylonian Adonis—is told that he shall see greater abominations, which he describes thus: "And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east; and they worshiped the sun toward

the east." Eze. 8:16. Yet Tertullian's best excuse for this custom is that it is no worse than what the heathen themselves did.

Very similar to the last quotation is the following from his address, "*Ad Nationes*," that is to the general public, the heathen. He says:—

"Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a well-known fact that we pray towards the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this? Do not many among you, with an affectation of sometimes worshiping the heavenly bodies likewise, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have even admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and for banqueting."—*Book 1, chap. 13.*

Here again he attempts to excuse himself by a retort, but his defense is childish in its simplicity. To the charge that the Christians worshiped the sun, a charge made because they prayed toward the east and observed the Sunday holiday, he replies that the heathen do the same thing. It is as though a Christian, when charged by a worldling with being a frequenter of the circus, should say, "Well, you attend circuses too." We have here, also, Tertullian's testimony as to the heathen origin of Sunday celebration. He says to them: "It is you, at all events, who have even admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day as the most suitable in the week . . . . for taking rest and for banqueting." We do

not depend upon Tertullian for proof that the Sunday festival was borrowed by the professed Christian Church from the heathen; but a careful perusal of this testimony may well be recommended to those who are fond of quoting Tertullian in behalf of Sunday observance. He declares that in devoting Sunday to festivity (they did not rest upon it), the Christians were simply following the example set them by the heathen.

In the following answer to the Jews we have Tertullian's belief in regard to the keeping of the Sabbath:—

"It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is demonstrated to have been temporary.

"For the Jews say, that from the beginning God sanctified the seventh day, by resting on it from all his works which he made; and that thence it was, likewise, that Moses said to the people: 'Remember the day of the Sabbaths, to sanctify it; every servile work ye shall not do therein, except what pertaineth unto life.' Whence we (Christians) understand that *we* still more ought to observe a Sabbath from all 'servile work' always, and not only every seventh day, but through all time. And through this arises the question for us, *what* Sabbath God willed us to keep. For the Scriptures point to a Sabbath eternal and a Sabbath temporal. For Isaiah the prophet says, '*Your* sabbaths my soul hateth;' and in another place he says, '*My* Sabbaths ye have profaned.' Whence we discern that the temporal Sabbath is human, and the eternal Sabbath is accounted divine, concerning which he predicts through Isaiah: 'And there shall be,' he says, 'month after month, and day after day, and Sabbath after Sabbath; and all flesh shall come to adore in Jerusalem, saith the Lord;' which we understand to have been fulfilled in the times of Christ, when 'all flesh'—that

is, every nation—'came to adore in Jerusalem' God the Father, through Jesus Christ his Son, as was predicted through the prophet: 'Behold, proselytes through me shall go unto thee.' Thus, therefore, before this temporal Sabbath, there was withal an eternal Sabbath foreshown and foretold; just as before the carnal circumcision there was withal a spiritual circumcision foreshown. In short, let them teach us, as we have already premised, that Adam observed the Sabbath; or that Abel, when offering to God a holy victim, pleased him by a religious reverence for the Sabbath; or that Enoch, when translated, had been a keeper of the Sabbath; or that Noah the ark-builder observed, on account of the deluge, an immense Sabbath; or that Abraham, in observance of the Sabbath, offered Isaac his son; or that Melchizedek in his priesthood received the law of the Sabbath."—*Answer to the Jews, chap. 4.*

This, together with the quotation just preceding it, shows that Tertullian did not believe in keeping any Sabbath. He did not believe in a literal Sabbath-day, but held that Sabbath-keeping consisted in doing any act that is pleasing to God. As to Sunday, neither he nor any other Christians of his day observed it as a Sabbath, nor with the idea that Sunday observance was in harmony with the Sabbath law; but they observed it as a festival day which, as has already been shown, they knew had its origin with the heathen.

The following quotation is very much to the same effect as the preceding, but it is given in order that nothing that Tertullian said of the Sabbath may be lacking:—

"Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: He kept the law thereof, and both in the former case did a work which was beneficial to the life of his disciples, for he indulged them with the relief of food when they were

hungry, and in the present instance cured the withered hand; in each case intimating by facts, 'I came not to destroy, the law, but to fulfill it,' although Marcion has gagged his mouth by this word. For even in the case before us he fulfilled the law, while interpreting its condition; *moreover*, he exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath and while imparting to the Sabbath-day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by his own beneficent action. For he furnished to this day divine safeguards,—a course which his adversary would have pursued for some other days, to avoid honoring the Creator's Sabbath, and restoring to the Sabbath the works which were proper for it. Since, in like manner, the prophet Elisha on this day restored to life the dead son of the Shunamite woman, you see, O Pharisee, and you too, O Marcion, how that it was proper employment for the Creator's Sabbaths of old to do good, to save life, not to destroy it; how that Christ introduced nothing new, which was not after the example, the gentleness, the mercy, and the prediction also of the Creator." —*Tertullian against Marcion, book 4, chap. 12.*

Tertullian's testimony on any point is of so little value that it is not worth while to do more than refer to his statement that "Christ did not at all rescind the law of the Sabbath." That statement is true; but it is only what the Scriptures tell us, and the Scripture statement gains nothing from Tertullian's indorsement. We believe the Fathers when they agree with the Bible, but we do not form or modify our opinions of the Bible from their statements. This very quotation affords an illustration of how we should be deceived if we did form our opinions of Scripture from the Fathers, for Tertullian says that Elisha restored the Shunamite's son to life on the

Sabbath-day, whereas in the Bible narrative it is plainly stated that it was "neither new moon, nor Sabbath." 2 Kings 4:23. As a general thing the Fathers were either ignorant of the Scriptures, or else they deliberately falsified to suit their own purposes.

There is only one more passage in Tertullian's writings that could by any possibility be considered as giving aid and comfort to the advocates of Sunday observance, and they are certainly welcome to all that they can get out of it. In his treatise, "*De Corona*," chapter 3, he speaks as follows concerning certain customs of the church:—

"To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the gospel. [That is to say, three times as large.] Then, when we are taken up (as new-born children), we taste first of all a mixture of milk and honey, and from that day we refrain from the daily bath for a whole week. We take also, in congregations before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the presidents, the sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at meal-times, and enjoined to be taken by all alike. As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birthday honors. We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday. We feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground. At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign," namely, of the cross.

It is quite possible that some zealous Sunday advocate may seize upon the above as authority for keeping Sunday, or at least as proof that Sunday was observed in the church in the third century. But let that person stop to consider that the Sunday "Lord's day" is not the only thing mentioned by Tertullian. Whoever keeps Sunday on the strength of Tertullian's testimony, must also practice trine immersion, and receive some milk and honey after baptism, to keep the devil away; he must also celebrate the sacrifice of the mass, making "offerings for the dead;" and he must not under any circumstances omit making the sign of the cross. In short, he must be a "good (Greek) Catholic." Whoever quotes Tertullian as authority for Sunday-keeping, and rejects trine immersion, prayers for the dead, and the sign of the cross, shows that he is either utterly inconsistent, or else that he has never read Tertullian for himself.

But Tertullian was well enough versed in the Scriptures to know that they do not warrant any such practices. He says that in trine immersion they made a "somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed;" and immediately following the chapter in which he speaks of this, of offerings for the dead, of Sunday observance, and the sign of the cross, he adds:—

"If, for these and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none."

Then what was Tertullian doing but setting himself and the church above the Bible? In other words, what was he doing but helping to develop the Catholic Church?

And now that the "sign of the cross" has been introduced, it will be well to trace it further, that we may note the progress of superstition, and see by what means

the Catholic custom of substituting meaningless forms for realities, found a place in the church. In his address, "*Ad Nationes*" (book 1, chap. 12), we find the following:—

"As for him who affirms that we are 'the priesthood of a cross,' we shall claim him as our co-religionist. A cross is, in its material, a sign of wood. Amongst yourselves also the object of worship is a wooden figure. Only, whilst with you the figure is a human one, with us the wood is its own figure. Never mind for the present what is the shape, provided the material is the same; the form, too, is of no importance, if so be it be the actual body of a god. If, however, there arises a question of difference on this point, what (let me ask) is the difference between the Athenian Pallas, or the Pharian Ceres, and wood formed into a cross, when each is represented by a rough stock, without form, and by the merest rudiment of a statue of unformed wood? Every piece of timber which is fixed in the ground in an erect position is a part of a cross, and indeed the greater portion of its mass. But an entire cross is attributed to us, with its transverse beam, of course, and its projecting seat. Now you have the less to excuse you, for you dedicate to religion only a mutilated, imperfect piece of wood, while others consecrate to the sacred purpose a complete structure. The truth, however, after all is, that your religion is *all* cross, as I shall show. You are indeed unaware that your gods in their origin have proceeded from this hated cross. Now, every image, whether carved out of wood or stone, or molten in metal, or produced out of any other richer material, must needs have had plastic hands engaged in its formation. Well, then, this modeler, before he did anything else, hit upon the form of a wooden cross, because even our own body assumes as its natural position the latent and concealed outline of a cross. Since the head rises upwards, and the back takes a straight direction, and the shoulders project laterally, if you simply place a man with his arms and hands outstretched, you will make the gen-

eral outline of a cross. Starting, then, from this rudimental form and prop, as it were, he applies a covering of clay, and so gradually completes the limbs, and forms the body, and covers the cross within with the shape which he meant to impress upon the clay; then from this design, with the help of compasses and leaden moulds, he has got all ready for his image which is to be brought out into marble, or clay, or whatever the material be of which he has determined to make his god. (This, then, is the process:) after the cross-shaped frame, the clay; after the clay, the god. In a well-understood routine, the cross passes into a god through the clayey medium. The cross then you consecrate, and from it the consecrated (deity) begins to derive its origin. By way of example, let us take the case of a tree which grows up into a system of branches and foliage, and is a reproduction of its own kind, whether it springs from the kernel of an olive, or the stone of a peach, or a grain of pepper which has been duly tempered under-ground. Now, if you transplant it, or take a cutting off its branches for another plant, to what will you attribute what is produced by the propagation? Will it not be to the grain, or the stone, or the kernel? Because, as the third stage is attributable to the second, and the second in like manner to the first, so the third will have to be referred to the first, through the second as the mean. We need not stay any longer in the discussion of this point, since by a natural law every kind of produce throughout nature refers back its growth to its original source; and just as the product is comprised in its primal cause, so does that cause agree in character with the thing produced. Since, then, in the production of your gods, you worship the cross which originates them, here will be the original kernel and grain, from which are propagated the wooden materials of your idolatrous images. Examples are not far to seek. Your victories you celebrate with religious ceremony as deities; and they are the more august in proportion to the joy they bring you. The frames on which you hang up

your trophies must be crosses: these are, as it were, the very core of your pageants. Thus, in your victories, the religion of your camp makes even crosses objects of worship; your standards it adores, your standards are the sanction of its oaths; your standards it prefers before Jupiter himself. But all that parade of images, and that display of pure gold, are (as so many) necklaces of the crosses. In like manner also, in the banners and ensigns, which your soldiers guard with no less sacred care, you have the streamers (and) vestments of your crosses. You are ashamed, I suppose, to worship unadorned and simple crosses."

In this, Tertullian's chief object seems to be to convince the heathen that they all had the cross, and that they made use of it both in religious and every-day affairs. Now when we consider that entire tribes of heathen, as in Africa and China, have been "converted" to Catholicism, simply by accepting the sign of the cross, and bowing before an image of the Virgin, it is very easy to see how the Catholic Church made such wonderful growth in the early centuries. It had only to convince the heathen that they were already almost Christian, and that was the most that there was to it. With Clement to teach them that their philosophy was simply the preparation for the gospel, with Tertullian to show them that they were already in possession of the "sign" of Christianity, and with "the church" ready to adopt the heathen Sunday festival and the custom of making libations for the dead, it could not have been a difficult task for the "mystery of iniquity" to develop into the "man of sin."

The following not only shows Tertullian's superstition concerning the sign of the cross, but is also a good sample of patristic Scripture "exposition:"—

"Joseph, again, himself was made a figure of Christ in

this point alone (to name no more, not to delay my own course), that he suffered persecution at the hands of his brethren, and was sold into Egypt, on account of the favor of God; just as Christ was sold by Israel—(and therefore), 'according to the flesh,' by his 'brethren'—when he is betrayed by Judas. For Joseph is withal blessed by his father after this form: 'His glory (is that) of a bull; his horns, the horns of an unicorn; on them shall he toss nations alike unto the very extremity of the earth.' Of course no one-horned rhinoceros was there pointed to, nor any two-horned minotaur. But Christ was therein signified: 'bull,' by reason of each of his two characters,—to some fierce, as Judge; to others gentle, as Saviour; whose 'horns' were to be the extremities of the *cross*. For even in a ship's yard—which is part of a *cross*—this is the name by which the extremities are called; while the central pole of the mast is a 'unicorn.' By this power, in fact, of the cross, and in this manner horned, he does now, on the one hand, 'toss' universal nations through *faith*, wafting them away from earth to heaven; and will one day on the other 'toss' them through *judgment*, casting them down from heaven to earth."—*Answer to the Jews, chap. 10.*

In the same chapter we have some more of the same:—

"But, to come now to Moses, why, I wonder, did he merely at the time when Joshua was battling against Amalek, pray *sitting* with hands expanded, when, in circumstances so critical, he ought rather, surely, to have commended his prayer by knees bended, and hands beating his breast, and a face prostrate on the ground; except it was that there, where the name of the Lord Jesus was the theme of speech—destined as he was to enter the lists one day singly against the devil—the figure of the *cross* was also necessary (that figure), through which Jesus was to win the victory?"

If anyone is still inclined to think that living near the time of the apostles necessarily made one a better expositor of Scripture, let him read the following:—

"Again, the mystery of this 'tree' we read as being celebrated even in the Books of the Reigns. For when the sons of the prophets were cutting 'wood' with axes on the bank of the river Jordan, the iron flew off and sank in the stream; and so, on Elisha the prophet's coming up, the sons of the prophets beg of him to extract from the stream the iron which had sunk. And accordingly Elisha, having taken 'wood,' and cast it into that place where the iron had been submerged, forthwith it rose and swam on the surface, and the 'wood' sank, which the sons of the prophets recovered. Whence they understood that Elijah's spirit was presently conferred upon him. What is more manifest than the mystery of this 'wood,'—that the obduracy of this world had been sunk in the profundity of error, and is freed in baptism by the 'wood' of Christ, that is, of his passion; in order that what had formerly perished through the 'tree' in Adam, should be restored through the 'tree' in Christ? while we, of course, who have succeeded to, and occupy, the room of the prophets, at the present day sustain in the world that treatment which the prophets always suffered on account of divine religion: for some they stoned, some they banished; more, however, they delivered to mortal slaughter,—a fact which they cannot deny.

"This 'wood,' again, Isaac the son of Abraham personally carried for his own sacrifice, when God had enjoined that he should be made a victim to himself. But, because these had been mysteries which were being kept for perfect fulfillment in the times of Christ, Isaac, on the one hand, with his 'wood' was reserved, the ram being offered which was caught by the horns in the bramble; Christ, on the other hand, in his times, carried his 'wood' on his own shoulders, adhering to the horns of the cross, with a thorny crown encircling his head,"—*Id., chap. 13.*

Surely "insanity" could not produce any more driveling nonsense than this. Yet Protestant ministers take precious time to translate and circulate such stuff, and the

writers of it are reverenced as Fathers of the Christian church. It seems as though people would surely rate the Fathers as they deserve, if they would only read their puerile writings; nevertheless, most of those who study them are so eager to find something which will give them a show of excuse for continuing some custom for which they can find no authority in the Bible, that they are willfully blind to the gross errors which they contain. The great majority of people, however, have no chance ever even to see the writings of the Fathers, and no time or patience to read them if they should see them; and so when they hear doctors of divinity gravely quoting from the Fathers, they have a sort of vague idea that those "venerable stagers" are the salt of the earth.

Following is Bishop Coxe's prefatory note to Tertullian's "Treatise on the Soul:"—

"In this treatise we have Tertullian's speculations on the origin, the nature, and the destiny of the human soul. There are, no doubt, paradoxes startling to a modern reader to be found in it, such as that of the soul's corporeity; and there are weak and inconclusive arguments. But after all such drawbacks (and they are not more than what constantly occur in the most renowned speculative writers of antiquity), the reader will discover many interesting proofs of our author's character for originality of thought, width of information, firm grasp of his subject, and vivacious treatment of it, such as we have discovered in other parts of his writings. If his subject permits Tertullian less than usual of an appeal to his favorite Holy Scripture, he still makes room for occasional illustration from it, and with his characteristic ability; if, however, there is less of this sacred learning in it, the treatise teems with curious information drawn from the secular literature of that early age."

And is this all that we can expect in the writings of

a Father of the church? Must we be content if he doesn't present any more weak, inconclusive, and nonsensical arguments than "constantly occur in the most renowned speculative writers of antiquity"? Is it enough if he shows his originality of thought, his "warm, ungoverned imagination," and his acquaintance with secular literature? If so, then why make any pretense of clinging to so prosy a book as the Bible? Why not take Plato's writings direct? But read the following, and strengthen your growing conviction that Tertullian as a professed Christian writer and teacher, deserves all that has been said of him, and much more:—

"I must also say something about the period of the soul's birth, that I may omit nothing incidental in the whole process. A mature and regular birth takes place, as a general rule, at the commencement of the tenth month. They who theorize respecting numbers, honor the number ten as the parent of all the others and as imparting perfection to the human nativity. For my own part, I prefer viewing this measure of time in reference to God, as if implying that the ten months rather initiated man into the ten commandments; so that the numerical estimate of the time needed to consummate our natural birth should correspond to the numerical classification of the rules of our regenerate life. But inasmuch as birth is also completed with the seventh month, I more readily recognize in this number than in the eighth the honor of a numerical agreement with the sabbatical period; so that the month in which God's image is sometimes produced in a human birth, shall in its number tally with the day on which God's creation was completed and hallowed. Human nativity has sometimes been allowed to be premature, and yet to occur in fit and perfect accordance with an *hebdomad* or sevenfold number, as an auspice of our resurrection, and rest, and kingdom." —*Treatise on the Soul, chap. 37.*

Such childish nonsense is seldom seen under the heading of reason. No one but a Catholic "theologian" could have been guilty of putting it forth in sober earnest.

Tertullian is celebrated for his knowledge of "philosophy," but the following extract shows that his knowledge of natural science was fully in keeping with his superstitious nature and his ignorance of the real teaching of Scripture:—

"Since, however, everything which is very attenuated and transparent bears a strong resemblance to the air, such would be the case with the soul, since in its material nature it is wind and breath (or spirit); whence it is that the belief of its corporeal quality is endangered, in consequence of the extreme tenuity and subtility of its essence. Likewise, as regards the figure of the human soul from your own conception, you can well imagine that it is none other than the human form; indeed, none other than the shape of that body which each individual soul animates and moves about. This we may at once be induced to admit from contemplating man's original formation. For only carefully consider, after God hath breathed upon the face of man the breath of life, and man had consequently become a living soul, surely that breath must have passed through the face at once into the interior structure, and have spread itself throughout all the spaces of the body; and as soon as by the divine inspiration it had become condensed, it must have impressed itself on each internal feature, which the condensation had filled in, and so have been, as it were, congealed in shape (or stereotyped). Hence, by this densifying process, there arose a fixing of the soul's corporeity; and by the impression its figure was formed and moulded. This is the inner man, different from the outer, but yet one in the twofold condition. It, too, has eyes and ears of its own, by means of which Paul must have heard and seen the Lord; it has, moreover all the other members of the body by the help of which

it effects all processes of thinking and all activity in dreams."—*Id., chap. 9.*

In chapter 50 he says that although Enoch and Elijah were translated without experiencing death, "they are reserved for the suffering of death, that by their blood they may extinguish antichrist." Every reader will recognize in that saying the ravings of an insane man.

The following from his treatise, "On Baptism" (chapter 1), will give a good idea of the cabalistic method of interpretation, which was common among both Jews and heathen, and which many professed Christian teachers borrowed:—

"A viper of the Cainite heresy, lately conversant in this quarter, has carried away a great number with her most venomous doctrine, making it her first aim to destroy baptism. Which is quite in accordance with nature; for vipers and asps and basilisks themselves generally do affect arid and waterless places. But we, little fishes, after the example of our ἰχθύς Jesus Christ, are born in water, nor have we safety in any other way, than by permanently abiding in water; so that most monstrous creature, who had no right to teach even sound doctrine, knew full well how to kill the little fishes by taking them away from the water!"

The Greek word ἰχθύς (*ichthus*) means fish. Christ was baptized, and we become united to him by baptism; and so Tertullian calls him our *ichthus* (our fish), and likens Christians to little fishes. The word, as applied to Christ, was formed by taking the initial lettters of the words in the sentence, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ, "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour." It was by such methods that many professed Christian writers "proved" the truth of their positions.

Tertullian seems to have known nothing of substituting anything for immersion, and it is quite evident that in his day nothing but actual baptism—immersion—was practiced. But this ordinance was even then grossly perverted, as we have already seen, and as the following from chapter 4 of his treatise, "On Baptism," shows:—

"But it will suffice to have *thus* called at the outset those points in which withal is recognized that primary principle of baptism,—which was even then forenoted by the very attitude *assumed* for a type of baptism,—that the Spirit of God, who hovered over (the waters) from the beginning, would continue to linger over the waters of the baptized. But a holy thing, of course, hovered over a holy; or else, from that which hovered over that which *was* hovered over borrowed a holiness, since it is necessary that in every case an underlying material substance should catch the quality of that which overhangs it, most of all a corporeal of a spiritual, adapted (as the spiritual is) through the subtleness of its substance, both for penetrating and insinuating. Thus the nature of the waters, sanctified by the Holy One, itself conceived withal the power of sanctifying. Let no one say, 'Why then, are we, pray, baptized with the very waters which then existed in the first beginning?' Not with those waters, of course, except in so far as the *genus* indeed is one, but the *species* very many. But what is an attribute to the *genus* re-appears likewise in the *species*. And accordingly it makes no difference whether a man be washed in a sea or a pool, a stream or a fount, a lake or a trough; nor is there any distinction between those whom John baptized in the Jordan and those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber, unless withal the eunuch whom Philip baptized in the midst of his journeys with chance water, derived (therefrom) more or less of salvation *than others*. All waters, therefore, in virtue of the pristine privilege of their origin, do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification; for

the spirit immediately supervenes from the heavens and rests over the waters, sanctifying them from himself; and being thus sanctified, they imbibe at the same time the power of sanctifying."

From this it is evident that Tertullian thought that the virtue of baptism lay in the quality of the water, and this idea was perpetuated in the Catholic Church, so that we find nothing but "holy water" used in all her ceremonies. But Tertullian believed that all water was sanctified by the brooding of the Spirit of God upon the face of the waters in the beginning, so that it was not necessary always to specially sanctify it.

In chapter 7 he bears testimony to the following perversion of the simple ordinance of baptism as practiced by the apostles:—

"After this, when we have issued from the font, we are thoroughly anointed with the blessed unction,—(a practice derived) from the old discipline, wherein on entering the priesthood, *men* were wont to be anointed with oil from a horn, ever since Aaron was anointed by Moses. Whence Aaron is called 'Christ,' from the 'chrism,' which is 'the unction;' which, when made spiritual, furnished an appropriate name to the Lord, because he was 'anointed' with the Spirit by God the Father; as *written* in the Acts: 'For truly they were gathered together in this city against thy holy Son whom thou hast anointed. Thus, too, in our *case*, the unction runs carnally (*i. e.* on the body), but profits spiritually; in the same way as the *act* of baptism itself too is carnal, in that we are plunged in water, *but* the *effect* spiritual, in that we are freed from sins."

The reader will later have the pleasure of reading Bingham's reference to this custom, in which he says that both men and women were often baptized naked,

when it will be seen that the first false idea prepared the way for a second, and for a practice that, to say the least, was not expedient.

Although Tertullian retained the primitive form of some things, as in immersion, evidently because he did not know of any other way, still his "warm, ungoverned imagination" led him to run everything to an extreme. Consequently, as with the cross, he found baptism in everything. Witness the following:—

"How many, therefore, are the pleas of nature, how many the privileges of grace, how many the solemnities of discipline, the figures, the preparations, the prayers, which have ordained the sanctity of water? First, indeed, when the people, set unconditionally free, escaped the violence of the Egyptian king by crossing over *through water*, it was *water* that extinguished the king himself, with his entire forces. What figure more manifestly fulfilled in the sacrament of baptism? The nations are set free from the world by means of *water*, to wit: and the devil, their old tyrant, they leave quite behind, overwhelmed in the *water*. Again, *water* is restored from its defect of 'bitterness' to its native grace of 'sweetness' by the tree of Moses. That tree was Christ, restoring, to wit, of himself, the *veins* of sometime envenomed and bitter nature into the all-salutary *waters* of baptism. This is the *water* which flowed continuously down for the people from the 'accompanying rock;' for if Christ is 'the Rock,' without doubt we see baptism blest by the *water* in Christ. How mighty is the grace of *water*, in the sight of God and his Christ, for the confirmation of baptism! Never is Christ without *water;* if, that is, he is himself baptized in *water;* inaugurates in *water* the first rudimentary displays of his power, when invited to the nuptials; invites the thirsty, when he makes a discourse, to his own sempiternal *water;* approves, when teaching concerning love, among works of charity, the

cup of *water* offered to a poor (child); recruits his strength at a *well;* walks over the *water;* willingly crosses the *sea;* ministers *water* to his disciples. Onward even to the passion does the witness of baptism last: while he is being surrendered to the cross, *water* intervenes; witness Pilate's hands: when he is wounded, forth from his side bursts *water;* witness the soldiers' lance!" —*Id., chap. 9.*

The following from his discourse, "On Prayer" (chapter 29), may also be taken as an evidence of Tertullian's "Catholicity," as well as of the childishness of his method of reasoning:—

"The angels, likewise, all pray; every creature prays; cattle and wild beasts pray and bend their knees; and when they issue from their layers and lairs, they look up heavenward with no idle mouth, making their breath vibrate after their own manner. Nay, the birds too, rising out of the nest, upraise themselves heavenward, and, instead of hands, expand the cross of their wings, and say somewhat to seem like prayer. What more then, touching the office of prayer?"

The next quotation, which will be the last from Tertullian, is quite long, but it will be read with interest, as showing how early in the Christian era the doctrine of purgatory, and of deliverance therefrom by the prayers of those still in the flesh, found a place in the church. It is the second chapter of "The Passion of Perpetua," and explains itself:—

"After a few days, whilst we were all praying, on a sudden, in the middle of our prayer, there came to me a word, and I named Dinocrates; and I was amazed that that name had never come into my mind until then, and I was grieved as I remembered his misfortune. And I felt myself immediately to be worthy, and to be called on to ask on his behalf. And for him I

began earnestly to make supplication, and to cry with groaning to the Lord. Without delay, on that very night, this was shown to me in a vision. I saw Dinocrates going out from a gloomy place, where also there were several others, and he was parched and very thirsty, with a filthy countenance and pallid color, and the wound on his face which he had when he died. This Dinocrates had been my brother after the flesh, seven years of age, who died miserably with disease—his face being so eaten out with cancer, that his death caused repugnance to all men. For him I had made my prayer, and between him and me there was a large interval, so that neither of us could approach to the other. And moreover, in the same place where Dinocrates was, there was a pool full of water, having its brink higher than was the stature of the boy; and Dinocrates raised himself up as if to drink. And I was grieved that, although that pool held water, still, on account of the height to its brink, he could not drink. And I was aroused, and knew that my brother was in suffering. But I trusted that my prayer would bring help to his suffering; and I prayed for him every day until we passed over into the prison of the camp, for we were to fight in the camp-show. Then was the birthday of Geta Cæsar, and I made my prayer for my brother day and night, groaning and weeping that he might be granted to me.

"Then, on the day on which we remained in fetters, this was shown to me. I saw that that place which I had formerly observed to be in gloom was now bright; and Dinocrates, with a clean body well clad, was finding refreshment. And where there had been a wound, I saw a scar; and that pool which I had before seen, I saw now with its margin lowered even to the boy's navel. And one drew water from the pool incessantly, and upon its brink was a goblet filled with water; and Dinocrates drew near and began to drink from it, and the goblet did not fail. And when he was satisfied, he went away from the water to play joyously, after the manner of children,

and I awoke. Then I understood that he was translated from the place of punishment."

Whoever accepts Sunday as the Sabbath on the authority of the early church, is bound by all the laws of consistency to accept the doctrine of purgatory, and all that it employs.

And now that the reader has had a fair chance to judge for himself of the character of Tertullian and his writings, it will doubtless be a relief to him to give expression to his feelings in these words of Dean Milman:—

"It would be wiser for Christianity, retreating upon its genuine records in the New Testament, to disclaim this fierce African, than to identify itself with his furious invectives by unsatisfactory apologies for their unchristian fanaticism."—*Note to chap. 15, paragraph 24, of Gibbon's Decline and Fall.*

So say we. Let us take that upon which we can depend. Whoever spends as much time as he ought in studying the "genuine records in the New Testament," will have no time in which to winnow the chaff of the Fathers for the sake of a possible grain of truth.

CHAPTER XIII.

ORIGEN.

THERE is no one of the Christian Fathers who is more highly commended than the subject of this sketch; and it can be said with truth that there is none other whose writings have had so blighting an influence. This is not because he was a vicious man, for there is little doubt but that, although misguided and fanatical in many things, and tinctured with heathen speculative philosophy, he was personally an upright man. But he was the father of spiritualistic exposition of Scripture, and by this, and also by teaching the Platonic philosophy to his many followers, he did incalculable injury to the church.

Origen was born at Alexandria about 185 or 186 A. D. On this point there is quite general agreement. He was an indefatigable worker, and produced more books than any other of the so-called Fathers. Killen (Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraph 22) says:—

"Origen was a most prolific author; and, if all his works were still extant, they would be far more voluminous than those of any other of the Fathers. But most of his writings have been lost; and, in not a few instances, those which remain have reached us either in a very mutilated form, or in a garbled Latin version."

It would have been a blessing to the world if they had all been lost, or, better still, if they had never been written, for there is not a heresy that has ever existed in the church, nor a false form of religion, that was not taught

by this metaphysical dreamer. Professor Harnack says, in the "Encyclopedia Britannica:"—

"By proclaiming the reconciliation of science with the Christian faith, of the highest culture with the gospel, Origen did more than any other man to win the Old World to the Christian religion."

But this was fatal to the purity of the church. The "science" which he attempted to reconcile with the Christian religion, was heathen philosophy. Of course he could show a harmony only by misrepresenting and perverting the Christian religion, bringing it nearly down to a level with that heathen philosophy. This, of course, made it easy for great numbers of the heathen to come into the church, since they did not have to give up much, nor make much change in their belief; and this in turn contributed immensely to the corruption of the church. And so instead of winning the Old World to the Christian religion, he lowered the Christian religion to the standard of the Old World. This conclusion is warranted by the following from Mosheim:—

"Gradually the friends of philosophy and literature acquired the ascendency. To this issue Origen contributed very much; for having early imbibed the principles of the new Platonism, he inauspiciously applied them to theology, and earnestly recommended them to the numerous youth who attended on his instructions. And the greater the influence of this man, which quickly spread over the whole Christian world, the more readily was his method of explaining the sacred doctrines propagated."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 3, part 2, chap. 1, sec. 5.*

Following is the estimate placed upon Origen's teaching, by Rev. Wm. Hogue, D. D., in the *Watchman* (Boston) of December 16, 1886:—

"He enthroned a metaphysical theology above the supernatural revelation, and then took the role of a qualified interpreter of that revelation; thus, by his wild style of allegorizing, muddling the clearest teachings, and leaving the reader in utter bewilderment."

The reader shall have a chance to verify every word of this. In order, however, to obtain a better idea of the baleful effect of the teaching of Origen, it is necessary to know something of "the New Platonism" to which he was so ardently devoted. The following from Mosheim is probably as concise an account of this mixture of heathen philosophy and Christian theology as we can find:—

"Near the close of this century [the second], a new philosophical sect suddenly started up, which in a short time prevailed over a large part of the Roman Empire, and not only nearly swallowed up the other sects, but likewise did immense injury to Christianity. Egypt was its birthplace, and particularly Alexandria, which for a long time had been the seat of literature and every science. Its followers chose to be called Platonics. Yet they did not follow Plato implicitly, but collected from all systems whatever seemed to coincide with their own views. And the ground of their preference for the name of Platonics, was, that they conceived Plato had explained more correctly than all thers, that most important branch of philosophy which treats of God and supersensible things.

"That controversial spirit in philosophy, which obliges everyone to swear allegiance to the dogmas of his master, was disapproved by the more wise. Hence among the lovers of truth, and the men of moderation, a new class of philosophers had grown up in Egypt, who avoided altercation and a sectarian spirit, and who professed simply to follow truth, gathering up whatever was accordant with it in all the philosophic schools. They as-

sumed therefore the name of Eclectics. But notwithstanding these philosophers were really the partisans of no sect, yet it appears from a variety of testimonies, that they much preferred Plato, and embraced most of his dogmas concerning God, the human soul, and the universe.

"This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria, as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of the Christians at Alexandria (Athenagoras, Pantænus, and Clemens Alexandrinus), are said to have approved of it. These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore that it was the duty of every wise man, and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defense of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent their regarding Plato as wiser than all others, and as having advanced sentiments concerning God, the soul, and supersensible things, more accordant with the principles of Christianity than any other.

"This eclectic mode of philosophizing was changed near the close of the century, when Ammonius Saccas with great applause, opened a school at Alexandria, and laid the foundation of that sect which is called the New Platonic. This man was born and educated a Christian, and perhaps made pretensions to Christianity all his life. Being possessed of great fecundity of genius as well as eloquence, he undertook to bring all systems of philosophy and religion into harmony; or, in other words, to teach a philosophy, by which all philosophers, and the men of all religions, the Christian not excepted, might unite together and have fellowship. And here especially, lies the difference between this new sect, and the eclectic philosophy which had before flourished in Egypt.

For the eclectics held that there was a mixture of good and bad, true and false, in all the systems; and therefore they selected out of all, what appeared to them consonant with reason, and rejected the rest. But Ammonius held that all sects professed one and the same system of truth, with only some difference in the mode of stating it, and some minute difference in their conceptions; so that by means of suitable explanations, they might with little difficulty be brought into one body."

"The grand object of Ammonius, to bring all sects and religions into harmony, required him to do much violence to the sentiments and opinions of all parties, philosophers, priests, and Christians; and particularly, by means of allegorical interpretations, to remove very many impediments out of his way. The manner in which he prosecuted his object, appears in the writings of his disciples and adherents; which have come down to us in great abundance. To make the arduous work more easy, he assumed that philosophy was first produced and nurtured among the people of the East; that it was inculcated among the Egyptians by Hermes, and thence passed to the Greeks; that it was a little obscured and deformed by the disputatious Greeks; but still by Plato, the best interpreter of the principles of Hermes and of the ancient oriental sages, it was preserved for the most part entire and unsullied; that the religions received by the various nations of the world were not inconsistent with this most ancient philosophy."

"To these assumptions he added the common doctrines of the Egyptians (among whom he was born and educated), concerning the universe and the deity, as constituting one great whole (Pantheism); concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of the soul, providence, the government of this world by demons, and other received doctrines, all of which he considered as true and not to be called in question. . . In the next place, with these Egyptian notions he united the philosophy of Plato, which he accomplished with little difficulty, by distorting

some of the principles of Plato, and by putting a false construction on his language. Finally, the dogmas of the other sects he construed, as far as was possible, by means of art, ingenuity, and the aid of allegories, into apparent coincidence with these Egyptian and Platonic principles.

"To this Egyptiaco-Platonic philosophy, the ingenious and fanatical man joined a system of moral discipline apparently of high sanctity and austerity. He permitted the common people, indeed, to live according to the laws of their country and the dictates of nature; but he directed the wise to elevate, by contemplation, their souls, which were the offspring of God, above all earthly things; . . . so that they might in the present life, attain to communion with the supreme Being, and might ascend after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal parent, and be forever united with him. And, being born and educated among Christians, Ammonius was accustomed to give elegance and dignity to these precepts by using forms of expression borrowed from the sacred Scriptures; and hence these forms of expression occur abundantly in the writings of his followers. To this austere discipline, he superadded the art of so purging and improving the imaginative faculty, as to make it capable of seeing the demons, and of performing many wonderful things by their assistance. His followers called this art Theurgy."

"That the prevailing religions, and particularly the Christian, might not appear irreconcilable with his system, Ammonius first turned the whole history of the pagan gods into allegory, and maintained that those whom the vulgar and the priests honored with the title of gods, were only the ministers of God, to whom some homage might and should be paid, yet such as would not derogate from the superior homage due to the supreme God; and in the next place he admitted that Christ was an extraordinary man, the friend of God, and an admirable Theurge. He denied that Christ aimed wholly to suppress the worship of the demons, those ministers of divine providence;

that, on the contrary, he only sought to wipe away the stains, contracted by the ancient religions; and that his disciples had corrupted and vitiated the system of their master."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 1, sec. 4–11.*

This medley formed the basis of Origen's theology. It will be seen at once that Neo-Platonism was nothing else but Spiritualism in its broadest sense. It could not be anything else, since the ancient heathen philosophers were all Spiritualists, if anything. It is a fact that the principles of ancient heathenism and modern Spiritualism are identical. The priests and priestesses of the ancient oracles were Spiritualist mediums, clairvoyants they would be called nowadays. The Neo-Platonism was refined Spiritualism, bearing the same relation to heathen Spiritualism that the so-called "Christian Spiritualism" of to-day does to the gross utterances of Spiritualists a few years ago. To Origen belongs the unsavory honor of bringing this Spiritualism into the church. When the "true inwardness" of Neo-Platonism is fully realized, and it is understood that it constituted Origen's religion, the reader will wonder how Origen could ever be regarded as a Christian. It was only because he lived in a time when almost anything was allowed to pass as Christianity, if it would only "draw" the masses.

Following his account of Neo-Platonism, Mosheim says:—

"This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour not a few things, of

which not a word can be found in the holy Scriptures. It also produced that gloomy set of men called mystics; whose system, if divested of its Platonic notions respecting the origin and nature of the soul, will be a lifeless and senseless corpse. It laid a foundation, too, for that indolent mode of life, which was afterwards adopted by many, and particularly by numerous tribes of monks; and it recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally, it alienated the minds of many in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined."—*Id., sec. 12.*

How those who know these things can ever quote the writings of Origen with approval, or can regard his advocacy even of a good cause as any help to it, is one of the mysteries of human nature which we shall not attempt to explain.

The following testimony is not needed to show Origen's heathen proclivities, but the reader will find that it will throw much light on the condition of the church in the second and third centuries, and will help to show how the great apostasy was brought about:—

"The spirit of philosophizing, however, so far from experiencing any decline or abatement, continued to increase and diffuse itself more and more, particularly towards the close of this century, when a new sect sprung up at Alexandria under the title of 'The Modern Platonists.' The founder of the sect was Ammonius Saccas, a man of a subtile, penetrating genius, but prone to deviate, in many things, from right reason, and too much inclined to indulge in ridiculous flights of imagination. In addition to a multitude of others who flocked to this man for instruction, his lectures were constantly attended by a great number of Christians, who were inflamed

with an eager desire after knowledge, and of whom two, namely, Origen and Heraclas, became afterwards very distinguished characters, the former succeeding to the presidency of the school, the latter to that of the church of Alexandria. By the Christian disciples of Ammonius, and more particularly by Origen, who in the succeeding century attained to a degree of eminence scarcely credible, the doctrines which they had derived from their master were sedulously instilled into the minds of the youth with whose education they were intrusted, and by the efforts of these again, who were subsequently, for the most part, called to the ministry, the love of philosophy became pretty generally diffused throughout a considerable portion of the church."—*Ecclesiastical Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 27.*

In the next section, Mosheim says of this new philosophy, of which Origen was so enthusiastic a disciple:—

"This great design of bringing about an union of all sects and religions, the offspring of a mind certainly not destitute of genius, but distracted by fanaticism, and scarcely at all under the dominion of reason, required, in order to its execution, not only that the most strained and unprincipled interpretations should be given to ancient sentiments, maxims, documents, and narratives, but also that the assistance of frauds and fallacies should be called in; hence we find the works which the disciples of Ammonius left behind them abounding in things of this kind; so much so indeed, that it is impossible for them ever to be viewed in any other light than as deplorable monuments of wisdom run mad."

In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," Professor Harnack says of Plotinus, a prominent teacher of the new philosophy:—

"A rigid monotheism appeared to Plotinus a miserable conception. He gave a meaning to the myths of the popular religions, and he had something to say even for

magic, soothsaying, and prayer. In support of image-worship he advanced arguments which were afterwards adopted by the Christian image worshipers."

Archdeacon Farrar, who says of Origen that "it would be impossible to speak in any terms but those of the highest admiration and respect" of him, gives the following testimony concerning him:—

"In many passages he speaks disparagingly of the literal truth of the Scripture narratives. This constitutes his retrogressive and disastrous originality. He constantly uses allegory where his own principles give him no excuse for doing so. He had so completely deadened in his own mind the feeling of historic truth, that he allegorizes not only such narratives as that of the creation, but even the law, the histories, and the prophets. The acceptance of the simple narrative becomes too commonplace for him; he compares it to the transgression of eating raw the Paschal lamb."—*History of Interpretation, pp. 197, 198.*

And on page 201 of the same book he says that the foundations of his exegetic system are based upon the sand. This is literally true, in the light of our Saviour's words in Matt. 26, 27. Therefore we say of Origen that if the appellation "Father" be given him, it must be interpreted to mean that he was the father of false doctrine in the Christian church.

Speaking of the rise of monkery, Schaff shows to some extent how Catholicism is indebted to Origen for that abomination. He says:—

"The Alexandrian Fathers first furnished a theoretical basis for this asceticism in the distinction, suggested even by the Pastor Hermæ, of a lower and a higher morality; a distinction, which, like that introduced at the same period by Tertullian, of mortal and venial sins, gave rise to many practical errors, and favored both moral

laxity and ascetic extravagance. . . . Origen goes still further, and propounds quite distinctly the Catholic doctrine of works of supererogation, works not enjoined indeed in the gospel, yet recommended, which were supposed to establish a peculiar merit and secure a higher degree of blessedness."—*History of Church, period 2, sec. 94.*

In support of the statement that Origen was the father of false and pernicious doctrines in the church, we quote again from Mosheim:—

"The same Origen, unquestionably, stands at the head of the interpreters of the Bible in this century. But with pain it must be added, he was first among those who have found in the Scriptures a secure retreat for all errors and idle fancies. As this most ingenious man could see no feasible method of vindicating all that is said in the Scriptures, against the cavils of the heretics and the enemies of Christianity, provided he interpreted the language of the Bible literally, he concluded that he must expound the sacred volume in the way in which the Platonists were accustomed to explain the history of their gods. He therefore taught, that the words, in many parts of the Bible, convey no meaning at all; and in some places, where he acknowledged there was some meaning in the words, he maintained that under the things there expressed, there was contained a hidden and concealed sense, which was much to be preferred to the literal meaning of the words. And this hidden sense it is that he searches after in his commentaries, ingeniously indeed, but perversely, and generally to the entire neglect and contempt of the literal meaning."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 3, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 5.*

In note 7 to the above paragraph Mosheim says:—

"Origen perversely turned a large part of biblical history into moral fables, and many of the laws into allegories. . . . But we must not forget his attachment

to that system of philosophy which he embraced. This philosophy could not be reconciled with the Scriptures, except by a resort to allegories; and therefore the Scriptures must be interpreted allegorically, that they might not contradict his philosophy."

Let the reader stop a while to consider the last two paragraphs, and then let him decide whether or not Origen is entitled in the slightest degree to the appellation, "Christian Father." He "found in the Scriptures a sure retreat for all error and idle fancies." He "perversely turned a large part of the biblical history into moral fables," and knew no way of combating heresy except by denying the Scriptures, and thus introducing worse heresies. And "he stands at the head of the interpreters" in the third century. The reader can easily judge from this of the standard of interpretation in those days, and of the state of the church which "enjoyed" such labors.

Bingham mentions the following false doctrines which Origen transmitted to the Catholic Church:—

"Origen reckons up seven ways, whereby Christians may obtain remission of sins, whereof five are apparently private actions of private men. The first is baptism, whereby men are baptized for the remission of sins. The second is the suffering of martyrdom. The third is almsdeeds; for our Saviour says, Give alms, and behold all things are clean unto you. The fourth is, forgiving the sins of our brethren; for our Lord and Saviour says, 'If ye from your heart forgive your brethren their trespasses, your Father will forgive your trespasses.' The fifth is, when one converts a sinner from the error of his ways. The sixth is, the abundance of charity, as our Lord says, 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, because she loved much.' The seventh is, the hard and laborious way of penance, when a man waters his couch with his tears,

and his tears are his bread day and night, and he is not ashamed to declare his sin to the priest of the Lord, and seek a cure."—*Antiquities, book 19, chap. 3.*

It passes all comprehension how, in the face of all this testimony, which is perfectly familiar to every scholar, Professor Worman can say, as he does in McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, "Origen may well be pronounced one of the ablest and worthiest of the church Fathers—indeed, one of the greatest moral prodigies of the human race." It is difficult to retain any respect whatever for the judgment of a man who can indulge in such gush over Origen. And the matter is so much the worse because, in the very same article in which the above language occurs, Professor Worman brings the identical charges against Origen, which are made in the quotations from Mosheim, Farrar, and Schaff. Such lavish and unmerited praise is an indication that Origen's influence is by no means dead, and that the reviving interest in his writings, and in patristic literature in general, augurs ill for the future condition of the Christian church. Origen's writings were largely instrumental in bringing about the great apostasy which resulted in the establishment of the papacy; and if they are taken as the guide of the theologian to-day, they must necessarily result in another similar apostasy. The Reformation was a protest against the speculative dogmas of the schoolmen, and a movement toward relying on the Bible as the only guide in matters of faith and practice; and just in proportion as the Fathers are esteemed, the Bible will be neglected, and the work of the Reformation undone.

Like all the so-called Christian Fathers, Origen was so intensely "liberal" that he could without scruple advo-

cate exactly opposite views of the same subject; but this characteristic is not so apparent in his writings as they now exist, for Rufinus, the friend of Origen, states in his prologue to "*Origen de Principiis*" that he consented to translate the work only on the condition that he should,—

"Follow as far as possible the rule observed by my predecessors, and especially by that distinguished man whom I have mentioned above, who, after translating into Latin more than seventy of those treatises of Origen which are styled Homilies, and a considerable number also of his writings on the apostles, in which a good many stumbling-blocks are found in the original Greek, so smoothed and corrected them in his translation, that a Latin reader would meet with nothing which could appear discordant with our belief. His example, therefore, we follow, to the best of our ability; if not with equal power of eloquence, yet at least with the same strictness of rule, taking care not to reproduce those expressions occurring in the works of Origen which are inconsistent with and opposed to each other. The cause of these variations we have explained more freely in the '*Apologeticus*,' which Pamphilus wrote in defense of the works of Origen, where we added a brief tract, in which we showed, I think, by unmistakable proofs, that his books had been corrupted in numerous places by heretics and malevolent persons. . . . For he there discusses those subjects with respect to which philosophers, after spending all their lives upon them, have been unable to discover anything."

The last sentence is very *nävely* expressed. The reader of Origen's works will be likely to conclude that Origen has not met with better success than the philosophers did, in discussing things upon which no one has been able to discover anything.

With one more testimony concerning Origen's heresies,

we will proceed to a closer examination of them. Says Killen:—

"This learned writer cannot be trusted as an interpreter of the inspired oracles. Like the Jewish cabalists, of whom Philo, whose works he had diligently studied, is a remarkable specimen, he neglects the literal sense of the word, and betakes himself to mystical expositions. In this way the divine record may be made to support any crotchet which happens to please the fancy of the commentator. Origen may, in fact, be regarded as the father of Christian mysticism; and, in after ages, to a certain class of visionaries, especially amongst the monks, his writings long continued to present peculiar attractions.

"On doctrinal points his statements are not always consistent, so that it is extremely difficult to form anything like a correct idea of his theological sentiments. . . . In his attempts to reconcile the gospel and his philosophy, he miserably compromised some of the most important truths of Scripture. The fall of man seems to be not unfrequently repudiated in his religious system; and yet, occasionally, it is distinctly recognized. He maintained the pre-existence of human souls; he held that the stars are animated beings; he taught that all men shall ultimately attain happiness; and he believed that the devils themselves shall eventually be saved."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 1, paragraphs 23, 24.*

We should not expect these statements to be believed if they were made by prejudiced persons; but they all come from those who often quote the Fathers in support of some theory or custom. But that nothing has been exaggerated concerning Origen, will now appear, as he is permitted to testify for himself.

The first thing to claim our attention shall be Origen's views of the Sabbath, which are, in brief, as follows:—

"There are countless multitudes of believers who, al-

though unable to unfold methodically and clearly the results of their spiritual understanding, are nevertheless most firmly persuaded that neither ought circumcision to be understood literally, nor the rest of the Sabbath, nor the pouring out of the blood of an animal, nor that answers were given by God to Moses on these points."—*De Principiis, book 2, chap. 7.*

This shows that Origen was so far from teaching the observance of Sunday, that he did not believe in any literal Sabbath. This was in keeping with his method of allegorizing everything.

Writing to the heathen philosopher Celsus, concerning the pagan festivals, Origen says:—

"If it be objected to us on this subject that we ourselves are accustomed to observe certain days, as for example the Lord's day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost, I have to answer, that to the perfect Christian, who is ever in his thoughts, words, and deeds serving his natural Lord, God the Word, all his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day. He also who is unceasingly preparing himself for the true life, and abstaining from the pleasures of this life which lead astray so many,—who is not indulging the lust of the flesh, but 'keeping under his body, and bringing it into subjection,'—such an one is always keeping Preparation day."—*Against Celsus, book 8, chap. 22.*

This passage is generally quoted as evidence in favor of Sunday-keeping. It is scarcely necessary at this point to remind the reader that it is of very little consequence to us what the church did in the third century, since it was then pretty well paganized. But there is nothing in favor of Sunday in the above extract. He speaks of the Lord's day without telling whether he means the first or seventh day; but from the connection it is quite evident

that he means the seventh day of the week, the true Lord's day. The sixth day of the week was universally known as "the preparation," and moreover the term occurs in connection with Passover and Pentecost. But whether he has reference to the seventh day or the first, he makes it plain that he did not believe in a literal observance of it. So his testimony concerning Sunday is a negative quantity.

In this connection it will be well to hear what he has to say of the Scriptures as a whole. In his discourse about the fundamental principles he says:—

"Nor even do the law and the commandments wholly convey what is agreeable to reason. For who that has understanding will suppose that the first, and second, and third day, and the evening and the morning, existed without a sun, and moon, and stars? and the first day was, as it were, also without a sky? And who is so foolish as to suppose that God, after the manner of a husbandman, planted a paradise in Eden, towards the east, and placed in it a tree of life, visible and palpable, so that one tasting of the fruit by the bodily teeth obtained life? and again, that one was a partaker of good and evil by masticating what was taken from the tree? And if God is said to walk in the paradise in the evening, and Adam to hide himself under a tree, I do not suppose that anyone doubts that these things figuratively indicate certain mysteries, the history having taken place in appearance, and not literally. . . . And what need is there to say more, since those who are not altogether blind can collect countless instances of a similar kind recorded as having occurred, but which did not literally take place? Nay, the gospels themselves are filled with the same kind of narratives; *e. g.*, the devil leading Jesus up into a high mountain, in order to show him from thence the kingdoms of the whole world, and the glory of them. For who is there among those who do not read

such accounts carelessly, that would not condemn those who think that with the eye of the body—which requires a lofty height in order that the parts lying (immediately) under and adjacent may be seen—the kingdoms of the Persians, and Scythians, and Indians, and Parthians, were beheld, and the manner in which their princes are glorified among men? And the attentive reader may notice in the gospels innumerable other passages like these, so that he will be convinced that in the histories that are literally recorded, circumstances that did not occur are inserted."—*De Principiis, book 4, chap. 1, sec. 16.*

David and the apostles spoke because they believed. (See Ps. 116:10; 2 Cor. 4:13.) Origen's claim to note as a biblical expositor seems to be on the ground that he did not believe. Surely he could not be expected to make Bible Christians of his followers, when he starts out with the statement that much of the historical record in the Bible is a fabrication, and that the law of God itself is repugnant to reason. What more could an Ingersoll or a Paine say? Every infidel will admit that there are some true things in the Bible. Therefore, if we take Origen's own statements, if we rank him as an expositor of Scripture alongside of the noted modern infidels, we shall be giving him all the credit he deserves. When you hear professed ministers of the gospel making light of the record in the first chapters of Genesis, and making a parade of the "new light" that has dawned upon this century, remember that they are simply adopting the views of the semi-pagan Origen. Not only does he deny the truth of the Old Testament records, but of the gospel narrative as well. In the section preceding the one just quoted, he says:—

"But since, if the usefulness of the legislation, and the sequence and beauty of the history, were universally evident of itself, we should not believe that any other thing could be understood in the Scriptures save what was obvious, the word of God has arranged that certain stumbling-blocks, as it were, and offenses, and impossibilities, should be introduced into the midst of the law, and the history, in order that we may not, through being drawn away in all directions by the merely attractive nature of the language, either altogether fall away from the (true) doctrines, as learning nothing worthy of God, or, by not departing from the letter, come to the knowledge of nothing more divine. And this also we must know, that the principal aim being to announce the 'spiritual' connection in those things that are done, and that ought to be done, where the Word found that things done according to the history could be adapted to these mystical senses, he made use of them, concealing from the multitude the deeper meaning; but where, in the narrative of the development of supersensual things, there did not follow the performance of those certain events, which was already indicated by the mystical meaning, the Scripture interwove in the history (the account of) some event that did not take place, sometimes what could not have happened; sometimes what could, but did not. And sometimes a few words are interpolated which are not true in their literal acceptation, and sometimes a larger number. And a similar practice also is to be noticed with regard to the legislation, in which is often to be found what is useful in itself, and appropriate to the times of the legislation; and sometimes also what does not appear to be of utility; and at other times impossibilities are recorded for the sake of the more skillful and inquisitive, in order that they may give themselves to the toil of investigating what is written, and thus attain to a becoming conviction of the manner in which a meaning worthy of God must be sought out in such subjects."

That is, impossibilities and untruths are recorded in the Bible, in order to stimulate the student to closer investigation. But if the student were once convinced that such is the case, he would cease to be a student, at least of the Bible, and would turn away from it in disgust. The whole tenor of Origen's teaching is in the direction of infidelity. And his infidelity is of the worst type, because it is put forth under cover of the name of Christianity.

The following paragraph exhibits not only his unbelief of the simple statements of Scripture, but also his fanciful method of interpretation:—

"But as there are certain passages of Scripture which do not at all contain the 'corporeal' sense, as we shall show in the following (paragraphs), there are also places where we must seek only for the 'soul,' as it were, and 'spirit' of Scripture. And perhaps on this account the water-vessels containing two or three firkins apiece are said to lie for the purification of the Jews, as we read in the gospel according to John: the expression darkly intimating, with respect to those who (are called) by the apostle 'Jews' secretly, that they are purified by the word of Scripture, receiving sometimes two firkins, *i. e.*, so to speak, the 'psychical' and 'spiritual' sense; and sometimes three firkins, since some have, in addition to those already mentioned, also the 'corporeal' sense, which is capable of (producing) edification. And six water-vessels are reasonably (appropriate) to those who are purified in the world, which was made in six days—the perfect number."—*Id., sec. 12.*

Comment on the above is unnecessary. Much more of a similar nature might be given directly on the subject of the Scriptures as a whole, but the same spirit will be noticed in what follows in regard to special points of the Scripture.

In "*De Principiis*" (book 1, chap. 7, sec. 2, 3) Origen makes the following theologico-philosophical deliverance:—

"In the first place, then, let us see what reason itself can discover respecting sun, moon, and stars,—whether the opinion, entertained by some, of their unchangeableness be correct,—and let the declarations of holy Scripture, as far as possible, be first adduced. For Job appears to assert that not only may the stars be subject to sin, but even that they are actually not clean from the contagion of it. The following are his words: 'The stars also are not clean in thy sight.' Nor is this to be understood of the splendor of their physical substance, as if one were to say, for example, of a garment, that it is not clean; for if such were the meaning, then the accusation of a want of cleanness in the splendor of their bodily substance would imply an injurious reflection upon their Creator. For if they are able, through their own diligent efforts, either to acquire for themselves a body of greater brightness, or through their sloth to make the one they have less pure, how should they incur censure for being stars that are not clean, if they receive no praise because they are so?

"But to arrive at a clearer understanding on these matters, we ought first to inquire after this point, whether it is allowable to suppose that they are living and rational beings; then, in the next place, whether their souls came into existence at the same time with their bodies, or seem to be anterior to them; and also whether, after the end of the world, we are to understand that they are to be released from their bodies; and whether, as we cease to live, so they also will cease from illuminating the world. Although this inquiry may seem to be somewhat bold, yet, as we are incited by the desire of ascertaining the truth as far as possible, there seems no absurdity in attempting an investigation of the subject agreeably to the grace of the Holy Spirit.

"We think, then, that they may be designated as living beings, for this reason, that they are said to receive commandments from God, which is ordinarily the case only with rational beings. 'I have given a commandment to all the stars,' says the Lord. What, now, are these commandments? Those, namely, that each star, in its order and course, should bestow upon the world the amount of splendor which has been intrusted to it. For those which are called 'planets' move in orbits of one kind, and those which are termed ἀπλανεῖς are different. Now it manifestly follows from this, that neither can the movement of that body take place without a soul, nor can living things be at any time without motion. And seeing that the stars move with such order and regularity, that their movements never appear to be at any time subject to derangement, would it not be the height of folly to say that so orderly an observance of method and plan could be carried out or accomplished by irrational beings?"

It cannot be said that there is in this anything wicked, except that it leaves the overruling, upholding power of God out of the question altogether. Not so much, however, can be said of what follows:—

"But whether any of these orders who act under the government of the devil, and obey his wicked commands, will in a future world be converted to righteousness because of their possessing the faculty of freedom of will, or whether persistent and inveterate wickedness may be changed by the power of habit into nature, is a result which you yourself, reader, may approve of, if neither in these present worlds which are seen and temporal, nor in those which are unseen and are eternal, that portion is to differ wholly from the final unity and fitness of things. But in the meantime, both in those temporal worlds which are seen, as well as in those eternal worlds which are invisible, all those beings are arranged, according to a regular plan, in the order and degree of their merits; so that

some of them in the first, others in the second, some even in the last times, after having undergone heavier and severer punishments, endured for a lengthened period, and for many ages, so to speak, improved by this stern method of training, and restored at first by the instruction of the angels, and subsequently by the powers of a higher grade, and thus advancing through each stage to a better condition, reach even to that which is invisible and eternal, having traveled through, by a kind of training, every single office of the heavenly powers. From which, I think, this will appear to follow as an inference, that every rational nature may, in passing from one order to another, go through each to all, and advance from all to each, while made the subject of various degrees of proficiency and failure according to its own actions and endeavors, put forth in the enjoyment of its power of freedom of will."—*Id., chap. 6, sec. 3.*

The apostle Jude says "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," have been "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the Judgment of the great day" (Jude 6); but Origen teaches that they will ultimately be restored to the favor of God. The Bible teaches that souls are purified by faith in Christ, and obedience to the truth through the Spirit; but Origen teaches that souls will be purged from sin by punishment. In the above extract we have the Roman Catholic purgatory as clearly set forth as it could possibly be; the only difference between Origen and other Catholics is that they provide an eternal hell for certain incorrigible ones, while Origen teaches the final restoration not only of all men but of demons also.

In the following the reader will find a combination of Universalism, Roman Catholicism, and Spiritualism:—

"I think, therefore, that all the saints who depart from

this life will remain in some place situated on the earth, which holy Scripture calls paradise, as in some place of instruction, and, so to speak, class-room or school of souls, in which they are to be instructed regarding all the things which they had seen on earth, and are to receive also some information respecting things that are to follow in the future, as even when in this life they had obtained in some degree indications of future events, although 'through a glass darkly,' all of which are revealed more clearly and distinctly to the saints in their proper time and place. If anyone indeed be pure in heart, and holy in mind, and more practiced in perception, he will, by making more rapid progress, quickly ascend to a place in the air, and reach the kingdom of Heaven, through those mansions, so to speak, in the various places which the Greeks have termed spheres, *i. e.*, globes, but which holy Scripture has called heavens; in each of which he will first see clearly what is done there, and in the second place, will discover the reason why things are so done: and thus he will in order pass through all gradations, following Him who hath passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, who said, 'I will that where I am, these may be also.'"—*Id., book 2, chap. 11, sec. 6.*

And the following is doctrine eminently adapted to satisfy every hardened sinner:—

"We find in the prophet Isaiah, that the fire with which each one is punished is described as his own; for he says, 'Walk in the light of your own fire, and the flame which ye have kindled.' By these words it seems to be indicated that every sinner kindles for himself the flame of his own fire, and is not plunged into some fire which has been already kindled by another, or was in existence before himself. Of this fire the fuel and food are our sins, which are called by the apostle Paul 'wood, and hay, and stubble.' . . . When the soul has gathered together a multitude of evil works, and an abundance of sins against itself, at a suitable time all that assembly of evil

boils up to punishment, and is set on fire to chastisements; when the mind itself, or conscience, receiving by divine power into the memory all those things of which it had stamped on itself certain signs and forms at the moment of sinning, will see a kind of history, as it were, of all the foul, and shameful, and unholy deeds which it has done, exposed before its eyes: then is the conscience itself harassed, and, pierced by its own goads, becomes an accuser and a witness against itself."—*Id., chap. 10, sec. 4.*

Here we have purgatory indeed, but it is a spiritual purgatory. The sinner is to be purified by fire, but the fire is to be simply his own sins. Stripped of the mass of verbiage, Origen's teaching is simply to the effect that all the punishment men will ever receive for their sins will be the knowledge of those sins,—the remorse of conscience constitutes the fire, and this remorse will eventually purge them from sin. In short, his teaching is that men will be freed from their sins simply by thinking about them. This, of course, leaves no room for salvation through faith in Christ; it leaves Christ entirely out of the question, and therefore Origen was not a Christian teacher.

Page after page might be filled with matter of the same sort as that already given, but to what profit would it be? If any are enamored of Origen's style, they can procure his writings and surfeit themselves. But what has been quoted about him and from him should be sufficient to convince any candid person that Origen's dreamy, fanciful, mystical, skeptical, and spiritualistic rantings could never have any other than a blighting influence upon the church.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GREAT APOSTASY.

In his second letter to the Thessalonians, the apostle Paul warned the brethren of "a falling away" (Greek, *apostasia*) from the truth, to result in the manifestation of a phase of wickedness which he styled "that Wicked," "that man of sin," "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4, 8. He added, "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth [hindereth] will let [hinder], until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed." Verses 7, 8. That is to say that the great apostasy was developing even in the days of Paul; he could trace its insidious workings even in many churches which he had planted; but there was a hindering element which for the time prevented its full development. Iniquity could not assume such proportions in the Christian church as to exalt itself "above all that is called God, or that is worshiped," so long as paganism was the prevailing religion, and was upheld by the power which ruled the world. The persecutions which the church suffered from the heathen kept it comparatively pure; but when Constantine elevated Christianity to the throne of the world, all the errors which for nearly three centuries had been insinuating themselves into the church, were given ample room for exercise.

It is not our purpose to give a complete history of the

progress of corruption in the church; we wish only to note briefly the progress of the apostasy until the time of Constantine, since it was in this period that nearly all the abominations of the Catholic Church had their birth. As a preface to this study, let the reader review the quotations which we have made from the writings of the apostles, in the chapter entitled, "The Apostolic Church," showing the evils that existed in the church even in their time. If such things existed when the churches had the benefit of the instruction of men commissioned by Heaven, and clothed with divine power, what might we not expect to find in the years following the death of the apostles? That which we have already quoted concerning the Fathers, and from their writings, is sufficient to show that there was an abundance of false teachers in the early church; we shall now see what was the legitimate result of their teaching.

We cannot better introduce this part of the subject than by the following quotation from Dr. Killen, concerning the heresies within a hundred years after the apostles:—

"But though the creed of the church was still to some extend substantially sound, it must be admitted that it was already beginning to suffer much from adulteration. One hundred years after the death of the apostle John, spiritual darkness was fast settling down upon the Christian community; and the Fathers, who flourished towards the commencement of the third century, frequently employ language for which they would have been sternly rebuked, had they lived in the days of the apostles and evangelists. Thus, we find them speaking of 'sins cleansed by repentance,' and of repentance as '*the price* at which the Lord has determined to grant forgiveness.' We read of '*sins cleansed* by alms and

faith,' and of the martyr, by his sufferings, 'washing away his own iniquities.' We are told that by baptism 'we are cleansed from all our sins,' and 'regain that Spirit of God which Adam received at his creation and lost by his transgression.' 'The pertinacious wickedness of the devil,' says Cyprian, 'has power *up to the saving water*, but in baptism he loses all the poison of his wickedness.' The same writer insists upon the necessity of *penance*, a species of discipline unknown to the apostolic church, and denounces, with terrible severity, those who discouraged its performance. 'By the deceitfulness of their lies,' says he, they interfere, 'that *satisfaction* be not given to God in his anger. . . . All pains are taken that *sins be not expiated by due satisfactions and lamentations*, that wounds be not washed clean by tears.' It may be said that some of these expressions are rhetorical, and that those by whom they were employed did not mean to deny the all-sufficiency of the great sacrifice; but had these Fathers clearly apprehended the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ, they would have recoiled from the use of language so exceedingly objectionable."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 5, paragraph 17.*

In the preface to the "Ancient Church," Dr. Killen says:—

"In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed its aspect. The bishop of Rome—a personage unknown to the writers of the New Testament—meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of divine institutions. Officers, for whom the primitive disciples could have found no place, and titles, which to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic."

The learned church historian, Mosheim, bears testimony to the same effect, and he also tells how it came to pass that unscriptural practices were introduced into the church. He says:—

"It is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity and to the great offense of sober and good men. The principal cause of this, I readily look for in the perverseness of mankind, who are more delighted with the pomp and splendor of external forms and pageantry, than with the true devotion of the heart, and who despise whatever does not gratify their eyes and ears. But other and additional causes may be mentioned, which, though they suppose no bad design, yet clearly betray indiscretion.

"*First,* There is good reason to suppose that the Christian bishops purposely multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and the pagans more friendly to them. For both these classes had been accustomed to numerous and splendid ceremonies from their infancy, and had made no question of their constituting an essential part of religion. And hence, when they saw the new religion to be destitute of such ceremonies, they thought it too simple, and therefore despised it. To obviate this objection, the rulers of the Christian churches deemed it proper for them to be more formal and splendid in their public worship.

"*Secondly,* The simplicity of the worship which Christians offered to the Deity, had given occasion to certain calumnies, maintained both by the Jews and the pagan priests. The Christians were pronounced atheists, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp, in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought they must introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of people; so that they

could maintain that they really *had* all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute, though under different forms."

"*Fourthly,* Among the Greeks and the people of the East nothing was held more sacred than what were called the 'mysteries.' This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say, that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to the Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms. This practice originated in the Eastern provinces; and thence, after the times of Adrian (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins), it spread among the Christians of the West. A large part therefore of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 1–5.*

In view of the above testimony, we think that no one need be led astray by any practice which he may find in the church. Let him first carefully and candidly examine the Scriptures to see if they sanction the practice. If they do not, then of course he should have nothing more to do with it. Then if he is anxious to know how the practice came to be one of the customs of the church, the quotations which we have made will enlighten him. Every ceremony of the church, if it be unscriptural, will be found to have been *adopted* from the heathen, or else to have been *invented* by the bishops of the early church, in order to catch the fancy of the heathen. By making the heathen believe that the Christian religion differed but very little from paganism, the bishops were enabled to gain many "converts." For

proof of this, the reader has only to review the extracts from the writings of the Fathers that have been made in previous chapters.

In a note to the paragraphs last quoted, Mosheim says:—

"It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here, a very apposite passage, which I accidentally met with, in Gregory Nyssen's 'Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus,' in the 'Works of Thaumaturgus,' as published by Vossius, p. 312, who gives the Latin only:—

"'When Gregory perceived that the ignorant and simple multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensitive pleasures and delights it afforded—he allowed them in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure (*i. e.*, as the thing itself, and both what precedes and what follows, place beyond all controversy, he allowed them at the sepulchers of the martyrs on their feast days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all things that the worshipers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples, on their festival days), hoping that in process of time they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life.'"

Read the above carefully. Mosheim says that Gregory Thaumaturgus, one of the most highly esteemed of the church Fathers, allowed his people, at their festivals in honor of the martyrs, not only "to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality," but also "to do all things that the worshipers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples on their festival days." In order to know what this latter expression implies, we have only to read the following from the same author:—

"Of the prayers of pagan worshipers, whether we regard the matter or the mode of expression, it is impossible to speak favorably; they were not only destitute

in general of everything allied to the spirit of genuine piety, but were sometimes framed expressly for the purpose of obtaining the countenance of Heaven to the most abominable and flagitious undertakings. In fact, the greater part of their religious observances were of an absurd and ridiculous nature, and in many instances strongly tinctured with the most disgraceful barbarism and obscenity. Their festivals and other solemn days were polluted by a licentious indulgence in every species of libidinous excess; and on these occasions they were not prohibited even from making the sacred mansions of their gods the scenes of vile and beastly gratification." —*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical Commentaries* (*introduction*), *chap. 1, sec. 2.*

"Absurd and ridiculous" practices; "disgraceful barbarism and obscenity;" "licentious indulgence in every species of libidinous excess;" and "scenes of vile and beastly gratification;"—such were the things in which one of the most renowned church Fathers indulged his parishioners, in order that they might not feel so much inclined to shake off their "Christian bonds" and return to heathenism. Surely this was doing evil that good might come. But however astute the *policy* of Gregory may have been, and we can easily believe that it would be effectual in holding his "converts," we cannot give him credit for great knowledge of human nature, if he thought that people would by such means "spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct mode of life."

Perhaps the reader may obtain a still clearer idea of the way the early church was paganized, by reading the following extracts from an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1852, on "Roman Catholic Missions in the Congo Free State," showing how in the seventeenth century the Jesuits "converted" the natives:—

"They introduced, as far as they could, all the rites and ceremonies of the Romish Church. The mass was celebrated with all due pomp; the confessional was erected in almost every village; penances of all grades and kinds were imposed; children and adults alike were required to perform the rosary, and the people *en masse* soon learned to make the sign of the cross, and most readily did they fall into the habit of wearing crucifixes, medals, and relics. There were certain heathenish customs, however, which the missionary Fathers found much difficulty in inducing the people to abandon; and they were never entirely successful until they substituted others of a similar character, which the natives regarded as a sort of equivalent for those they were required to give up."

The writer then gives an account of some of the superstitious rites which the Jesuits substituted for those which the heathen had formerly practiced, and continues thus:

"Another custom of the country at the root of which the ax was laid, was that of guarding their fruit trees and patches of grain with *feteiches*, which were supposed to possess themselves the power of punishing all trespassers. The practice was interdicted, but the people at the same time were recommended 'to use consecrated palm branches, and here and there in their patches of corn to set up the sign of the cross.' These details might be extended to almost any length, if it were necessary. A Roman Catholic of discernment may possibly see an essential difference between these heathenish customs that were abolished, and those that were substituted in their place; but we seriously doubt whether the simple-minded people of Congo were ever conscious of any material change in their code of superstitious rites, or derived any essential advantage by the exchange."

The same course is pursued to-day by Roman Catholic missionaries in heathen lands. It is very fitting that this should be so, for it was by such means that the Roman

Catholic Church came into existence. It is very doubtful, also, if many simple-minded people in the early centuries were ever conscious of any material change in their code of superstitious rites, or derived any essential advantage by the change. It is common to speak of the "ruins of paganism," upon which "the church" was built, but building upon those ruins was the ruin of Christianity, so far as "the church" was concerned. A church built of ruins will be a ruin from the start.

HEATHEN AND CATHOLIC MYSTERIES.

We have already quoted Mosheim's statement that a large part of the Christian observances and institutions, even in the second century, had the aspect of pagan mysteries. Let us now read something more about those same mysteries. It will tally very well with what has been said of Gregory Thaumaturgus. Says Mosheim:—

"In addition to the public service of the gods, at which everyone was permitted to be present, the Egyptians, Persians, Grecians, Indians, and some other nations, had recourse to a species of dark and recondite worship, under the name of mysteries. . . . None were admitted to behold or partake in the celebration of these mysteries, but those who had approved themselves worthy of such distinction, by their fidelity and perseverance in the practice of a long and severe course of initiatory forms. . . . In the celebration of some of them, it is pretty plain that many things were done in the highest degree repugnant to virtue, modesty, and every finer feeling. . . . It is certain that the highest veneration was entertained by the people of every country for what were termed the mysteries; and the Christians, perceiving this, were induced to make their religion conform in many respects to this part of the heathen model, hoping that it might thereby the more readily obtain a favorable re-

ception with those whom it was their object and their hope to convert."—*Ecclesiastical Commentaries (introduction), chap. 1, sec. 13.*

In a note to the above we find the following:—

"They adopted, for instance, in common with the pagan nations, the plan of dividing their sacred offices into two classes: the one public, to which every person was freely admitted; the other secret or mysterious, from which all the unprofessed were excluded. The initiated were those who had been baptized; the unprofessed, the catechumens. The mode of preparatory examination also bore a strong resemblance, in many respects, to the course of initiatory forms observed by the heathen nations, in regard to their mysteries. In a word, many forms and ceremonies, to pass over other things of the Christian worship, were evidently copied from these sacred rites of paganism; and we have only to lament that what was thus done with unquestionably the best intentions, should in some respects have been attended with an evil result."

How anyone, after reading testimonies like these, can complacently follow any practice on the ground that it has been the custom of the church for centuries, is a wonder to us. Well did Jeremiah say, "The customs of the people are vain." Jer. 10:3. To claim that a practice must be correct because it is drawn from church tradition, is about as logical as it would be to say that certain viands must be wholesome, because they were rescued from the gutter. It is true that we *may* find a wholesome article of food in the mire of the streets; but we should not regard the fact that it was found in such a place as evidence that it was good; so tradition *may* bring to us some things that are good; but the fact that they come to us by tradition should not recommend

them to us, but should, on the contrary, cause us to regard them with suspicion. Says Dr. Archibald Bower, in his "History of the Popes:"—

"To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. If it is affirmed by him [*i. e.*, by tradition] alone, we can at most but suspend our belief, not rejecting it as false, because a liar may sometimes speak truth; but we cannot, upon his bare authority, admit it as true."—*Vol. 1, p. 1.*

So whenever we find a "custom" which rests on church tradition, the "person of known veracity" to whom we shall refer it is the Bible. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Dr. Carson, in his great work on baptism, says:—

"With respect to religious doctrines and institutions, there is no antecedent probability that those in existence at any time are actually in Scripture. The vast majority of religious rites used under the Christian name are the mere invention of men; and not a single institution of the Lord Jesus, as it is recorded in the New Testament, has been left unchanged; and it is no injustice to put each of them to the proof, because, if they are in Scripture, proof is at all times accessible."—*Page 6.*

This being the case, it is perfectly just to conclude, when men appeal to "the custom of the church" in support of any practice, that they are conscious that the Bible will not sustain their position. No one who can support his cause by the Scriptures will ever appeal to the Fathers or to tradition and custom.

But we have further direct testimony concerning the perversion of Christian ordinances. We have seen how

an eminent Father allowed the people to retain heathen customs on their festival days. As early as in the second century, within less than a hundred years after the death of the last apostle, the Christian church had begun to assume the color of heathenism. And as the heathen "mysteries," which were accompanied by so much that is pleasing to the natural heart, must have been that which the heathen would be the most loth to give up, the church Fathers, in the excess of their perverted zeal, claimed that they too had "mysteries" connected with their religion. Mosheim thus treats of this:—

"Religion having thus, in both its branches, the speculative as well as the practical, assumed a twofold character, the one public or common, the other private or mysterious, it was not long before a distinction of a similar kind took place also in the Christian discipline, and form of divine worship. For observing that in Egypt, as well as in other countries, the heathen worshipers, in addition to their public religious ceremonies, to which everyone was admitted without distinction, had certain secret and most sacred rites, to which they gave the name of '*mysteries*,' and at the celebration of which none, except persons of the most approved faith and discretion, were permitted to be present, the Alexandrian Christians first, and after them others, were beguiled into a notion that they could not do better than make the Christian discipline accommodate itself to this model. The multitude professing Christianity were therefore divided by them into the '*profane*,' or those who were not as yet admitted to the mysteries, and the '*initiated*,' or faithful and perfect. To the former belonged the '*catechumens*,' or those that had indeed enrolled themselves under the Christian banner, but had never been regularly received into the fellowship of Christ's flock by the sacrament of baptism; as also those who, for some transgression or offense, had been expelled from communion

with the faithful. The latter, who were properly termed '*the church*,' consisted of all such as had been regularly admitted into the Christian community by baptism, and had never forfeited their privileges, as well as of those who, having by some misconduct incurred the penalty of excommunication, had, upon their repentance, been again received into the bosom of the church. It became, moreover, customary, even in this century, more especially in Egypt and the neighboring provinces, for persons desirous of being admitted into either of these classes, to be previously exercised and examined, we may even say tormented, for a great length of time, with a variety of ceremonies, for the most part nearly allied to those that were observed in preparing people for a sight of the heathen mysteries. Upon the same principle, a twofold form was given to divine worship, the one general and open to the people at large, the other special and concealed from all, except the faithful or initiated. To the latter belonged the common prayers, baptism, the *agapæ* or love-feasts, and the Lord's Supper; and as none were permitted to be present at these '*mysteries*,' as they were termed, save those whose admission into the fellowship of the church was perfect and complete, so likewise was it expected that, as a matter of duty, the most sacred silence should be observed in regard to everything connected with the celebration of them, and nothing whatever relating thereto be committed to the ears of the profane. From this constitution of things it came to pass, not only that many terms and phrases made use of in the heathen mysteries were transferred and applied to different parts of the Christian worship, particularly to the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, but that, in not a few instances, the sacred rites of the church were contaminated by the introduction of various pagan forms and ceremonies."—*Ecclesiastical Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 36.*

Comment on the above is unnecessary, and so we leave it, to introduce a statement from Dr. Killen, concerning the perversion of the communion:—

"In the third century superstition already recognized a mystery in the mixture [*i. e.*, of the cup]. 'We see,' says Cyprian, 'that in the water *the people* are represented, but that in the wine is exhibited the blood of Christ. When, however, in the cup water is mingled with wine, the people are united to Christ, and the multitude of the faithful are coupled and conjoined to him on whom they believe.' The bread was not put into the mouth of the communicant by the administrator, but was handed to him by a deacon; and it is said that, the better to show forth the unity of the church, all partook of one loaf made of a size sufficient to supply the whole congregation. The wine was administered separately, and was drunk out of a cup or chalice. As early as the third century an idea began to be entertained that the eucharist was necessary to salvation, and it was, in consequence, given to infants. None were now suffered to be present at its celebration but those who were communicants; for even the catechumens, or candidates for baptism, were obliged to withdraw before the elements were consecrated."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 3, chap. 3, paragraph 5.*

Here we have the Roman Catholic mass fully developed within but little over a hundred years after the death of the apostles. In some things, however, we must allow that the ancients were more consistent than those of later years. Infant baptism, so called, is at the present time practiced by the greater part of Christendom. Now nothing is more easily demonstrated than that baptism is the door unto the church. "By one spirit are we all baptized into one body." This is admitted by those who administer to infants what they term "baptism," for Pedobaptists never baptize those who have been sprinkled in infancy. But to join in the celebration of the Lord's Supper is not a privilege only, but it is the duty

of every member of the church. Therefore, if it is proper and right to baptize infants, it is certainly as necessary to administer to them the communion also. To deprive any church-member of the blessings of the communion is a grievous wrong. In this respect the ancients were certainly consistent in their error.

PERVERSION OF THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM.

It was not till a later period than that of which we are now writing, that sprinkling was substituted for baptism. In proof of this we quote the following from 'McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia,' concerning Novatian, who lived in the middle of the third century:—

"It was altogether irregular and contrary to ecclesiastical rules to admit a man to the priestly office who had been baptized in bed; that is, who had been merely sprinkled, and had not been wholly immersed in water in the ancient method. For by many, and especially by the Roman Christians, the baptism of clinics (so they called those who, lest they should die out of the church, were baptized on a sick-bed) was accounted less perfect, and indeed less valid, and not sufficient for the attainment of salvation."

Thus we see that it was not till after the third century that sprinkling was substituted for baptism. How it finally came to take the place of baptism is very readily seen; for since the Christians thought that if anyone should die without baptism he could not enter Heaven, they introduced "clinical baptism," that is, the sprinkling of those who were converted while on their death-bed, and who could not leave their beds to be immersed. But the thought would soon very naturally present itself, that if sprinkling were valid baptism in one case it must

be in every case, and so, being much more easily administered and received, it soon entirely superseded true baptism.

But although in the period of which we are now writing (the second century) immersion was still practiced, we must not suppose that the ordinance of baptism had entirely escaped the prevailing contamination. After speaking of the baptism of bells, Bingham says:—

"And here we meet with a practice a little more ancient, but not less superstitious, than the former; which was a custom that began to prevail among some weak people in Africa, of giving baptism to the dead. The third council of Carthage [A. D. 252] speaks of it as a thing that ignorant Christians were a little fond of, and therefore gives a seasonable caution against it, to discourage the practice."—*Antiquities of the Christian Church, book 11, chap. 4.*

Killen (Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 3, chap. 2, paragraphs 10, 12) gives the following additional testimony as to how baptism was perverted from its original simplicity:—

"The candidate, as early as the third century, was *exorcised* before baptism, with a view to the expulsion of evil spirits; and, in some places, after the application of the water, when the kiss of peace was given to him, a mixture of milk and honey was administered. He was then anointed, and marked on the forehead with the sign of the cross."

"Baptism, as dispensed in apostolic simplicity, is a most significant ordinance; but the original rite was soon well-nigh hidden behind the rubbish of human inventions. The milk and honey, the unction, the crossing, the kiss of peace, and the imposition of hands, were all designed to render it more imposing; and, still farther to deepen the impression, it was already administered in the

presence of none save those who had themselves been thus initiated. But the foolishness of God is wiser than man. Nothing is more to be deprecated than an attempt to improve upon the institutions of Christ. Baptism, as established by the divine founder of our religion, is a visible exhibition of the gospel; but, as known in the third century, it had much of the character of one of the heathen mysteries. It was intended to confirm faith; but it was now contributing to foster superstition. How soon had the gold become dim, and the most fine gold been changed!"

Concerning another superstition connected with baptism, Bingham speaks as follows:—

"Immediately after the unction the minister proceeded to consecrate the water, or the bishop, if he were present, consecrated it, while the priests were finishing the unction. For so the author under the name of Dionysius represents it. While the priests, says he, are finishing the unction, the bishop comes to the mother of adoption, so he calls the font, and by invocation sanctifies the water in it, thrice pouring in some of the holy chrism in a manner representing the sign of the cross. This invocation or consecration of the water by prayer, is mentioned by Tertullian; for he says, The waters are made the sacrament of sanctification by invocation of God. The Spirit immediately descends from Heaven, and resting upon them sanctifies them by himself, and they, being so sanctified, imbibe the power of sanctifying. And Cyprian declares that the water must first be cleansed and sanctified by the priest, that it may have power by baptism to wash away the sins of man. And so the whole council of Carthage, in the time of Cyprian, says, The water is sanctified by the prayer of the priest to wash away sin."—*Antiquities, book 11, chap. 10.*

Here again we have the "holy water" which plays so important a part in all Catholic ceremonies. All these ceremonies in connection with baptism were performed in

order that the newly converted heathen might be impressed with the idea that the new religion had as much of pomp as the old. It was to Tertullian, as we have already seen (pp. 211, 212), that the Catholic Church is indebted for the superstition that the virtue of baptism lay in the water, and that as a consequence it must be sanctified.

In another place Bingham says of the superstitions connected with baptism:—

"We find in some of the ancient ritualists, but not in all, mention made of an unction preceding baptism, and used by way of preparation for it. . . . But the writers of the following ages speak distinctly of two unctions, the one before, the other after baptism; which they describe by different names and different ceremonies, to distinguish them one from the other. . . . Dr. Cave and some other learned persons are of opinion, that together with this unction, the sign of the cross was made upon the forehead of the party baptized. . . . To understand this matter exactly, we are to distinguish at least four several times, when the sign of the cross was used, during the preparation or consummation of the ceremonies of baptism. 1. At the admission of catechumens to the state of catechumenship and the general name of Christians. 2. In the time of exorcism and imposition of hands, while they were passing through the several stages of catechumens. 3. At the time of this unction before baptism. 4. And lastly, at the unction of confirmation, which was then usually the conclusion of baptism both in adult persons and infants; and many of the passages which speak of the sign of the cross in baptism, do plainly relate to this, as an appendage of baptism, and closely joined to it, as the last ceremony and consummation of it. . . . The third use of it was in this unction before baptism. For so the author under the name of Dionysius, describing the ceremony of anoint-

ing the party before the consecration of the water, says, The bishop begins the unction by thrice signing him with the sign of the cross, and then commits him to the priests to be anointed all over the body, whilst he goes and consecrates the water in the font."—*Id., chap. 9.*

That this was done as early as the second century, is evident from what has been quoted from Tertullian. (See p. 212.)

The reader may wonder somewhat how the candidate for baptism could be "anointed all over the body;" but his wonder on this score may be set at rest, while his amazement at the degradating superstition into which men early fell, may be increased, by reading what Bingham has to say further on this subject:—

"The ancients thought that immersion, or burying under water, did more lively represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ, as well as our own death unto sin, and rising again to righteousness; and the divesting or unclothing the person to be baptized, did also represent the putting off the body of sin, in order to put on the new man, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. For which reason they observed the way of baptizing all persons naked and divested, by a total immersion under water, except in some particular cases of great exigence, wherein they allowed of sprinkling, as in the case of clinic baptism, or where there was a scarcity of water."—*Id., chap. 11.*

Truly here were "mysteries" which should have compensated the convert from heathenism for all that he had left. For the person who can say that no scandalous practices would necessarily result from the ordinance of baptism thus administered to all classes of people, and in secret, must first take leave of his senses. But Bingham goes on in this same connection to state the reason which they gave for baptizing people naked:—

"St. Chrysostom, speaking of baptism, says, Men were as naked as Adam in paradise, but with this difference: Adam was naked because he had sinned, but in baptism, a man was naked that he might be freed from sin; the one was divested of his glory which he once had, but the other put off the old man, which he did as easily as his clothes. St. Ambrose says, Men came as naked to the font, as they came into the world; and thence he draws an argument by way of allusion, to rich men, telling them how absurd it was, that a man who was born naked of his mother, and received naked by the church, should think of going rich into Heaven. Cyril of Jerusalem takes notice of this circumstance, together with the reasons of it, when he thus addresses himself to persons newly baptized: As soon as ye came into the inner part of the baptistery, ye put off your clothes, which is an emblem of putting off the old man with his deeds; and being thus divested, ye stood naked, imitating Christ, that was naked upon the cross, who by his nakedness spoiled principalities and powers, publicly triumphing over them in the cross. O wonderful thing! ye were naked in the sight of men, and were not ashamed, in this truly imitating the first man Adam, who was naked in paradise, and was not ashamed. . . . And Zeno Veronensis, reminding persons of their baptism, bids them rejoice, for they went down naked into the font, but rose again clothed in a white and heavenly garment, which if they did not defile, they might obtain the kingdom of Heaven. Athanasius, in his invectives against the Arians, among other things, lays this to their charge, that by their persuasions the Jews and Gentiles broke into the baptistery, and there offered such abuses to the catechumens as they stood with their naked bodies, as was shameful and abominable to relate. And a like complaint is brought against Peter, bishop of Apamea, in the council of Constantinople, under Mennas, that he cast out the neophytes, or persons newly baptized, out of the baptistery, when they were without their clothes and

shoes. All which are manifest proofs that persons were baptized naked, either in imitation of Adam in paradise, or our Saviour upon the cross, or to signify their putting off the body of sin, and the old man with his deeds."

Benjamin Franklin, in his "Autobiography," tells how he came to break his resolution not to eat anything that had had life, and the conclusion which he draws seems very appropriate here. He says:—

"I had been formerly a great lover of fish, and when it came out of the frying-pan it smelt admirably well. I balanced some time between principle and inclination, till, recollecting that when the fish were opened I saw smaller fish taken out of their stomachs, then, thought I, 'If you eat one another, I don't see why we may not eat you;' so I dined upon cod very heartily, and have since continued to eat as other people, returning only now and then occasionally to a vegetable diet. So convenient a thing it is to be a *reasonable creature*, since it enables one to find or *make a reason* for everything one has a mind to do."

Franklin's conclusion is very apt. When people determine upon a certain course, there is never any lack of "reasons" for so doing. These early Christians (?) had determined to copy the heathen "mysteries" as closely as possible, and consequently they were not at a loss to find "scriptural" warrant for their course. But we have not heard all of Bingham's testimony. Although he does not accuse them of any licentious act, he gives evidence which, taking human nature into the account, and especially human nature as it then was, leaves no room for conjecture as to the effect. He continues:—

"And this practice was then so general, that we find no exception made, either with respect to the tenderness of infants, or the bashfulness of the female sex, save only

UNIVERSITY

where the case of sickness or disability made it necessary to vary from the usual custom. St. Chrysostom is an undeniable evidence in this matter. For writing about the barbarous proceedings of his enemies against him on the great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, among other tragical things which they committed, he reports this for one, That they came armed into the church, and by violence expelled the clergy, killing many in the baptistery, with which the women, who at that time were divested in order to be baptized, were put into such a terror that they fled away naked, and could not stay in the fright to put on such clothes as the modesty of their sex required."—*Antiquities, book 11, chap. 11.*

We will not disgust the reader with more of this at present. We do not give this much with the idea that it will give him pleasure, nor because we take pleasure in dwelling upon the frailties of others. We do it in order to show that a thing is not necessarily proper and right because it was practiced in the church at a very early period. It is a very common thing for people to argue that, although we have no direct scriptural warrant for the observance of Sunday, it must be proper to do so, because many of the early Christians kept it, and they must have received the practice from the apostles. But we think that no one will claim that the early Christians received from the apostles the custom of baptizing people naked; and therefore the argument from the custom of "the church," in behalf of Sunday-keeping, falls to the ground. We do not believe that all professed Christians indulged in such shameful perversions of a sacred ordinance. That there were those who adhered to the gospel as delivered in its simplicity and purity by our Saviour, there can be no doubt; but the fact that abominable and heathenish things were done in

the name of Christianity, should cause us unhesitatingly to reject anything which we are urged to adopt on the sole ground that it was practiced by the early church.

It may be well to add right here that the men from whom we have quoted cannot be accused of being prejudiced against the early church, for, in spite of the evidence which they give of its corruption, they blindly follow the "custom" of the church in many particulars, especially in the matter of Sunday observance, and seem to imagine that "the custom of the church" can sanctify any act to which they are inclined. "So convenient a thing it is to be a *reasonable creature.*"

SIGN OF THE CROSS, AND IMAGES.

In our brief study of the perversion of the ordinance of baptism, we found frequent reference to the "sign of the cross." This superstition, which is still retained in the Catholic Church, was not confined to church ceremonies, but was connected with almost every act of life. Says Gibbon:—

"In all occasions of danger and distress, it was the practice of the primitive Christians to fortify their minds and bodies by the sign of the cross, which they used, in all their ecclesiastical rites, in all the daily occurrences of life, as an infallible preservative against every species of spiritual or temporal evil."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, paragraph 13.*

That this is not a prejudiced statement appears from the following from Mosheim, whose Christianity no one will question:—

"In the sign of the cross, they supposed there was great efficacy against all sorts of evils, and particularly against the machinations of evil spirits; and therefore no one undertook anything of much moment, without first

crossing himself."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1. cent. 3, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 5.*

Tertullian says that this was the custom in his day, and both he and Justin Martyr taught that the sign of the cross had great efficacy, and was absolutely essential. The reader will remember the extract from Tertullian, in which he claims that the Israelites conquered the Amalekites, not because Moses prayed, but because he exhibited the form of the cross.

For this custom, as for all others, there was, of course, no difficulty in finding a valid "reason." But we find that, like all other superstitions or abominable practices that were foisted upon the Christian church, it had its origin in heathenism. Says Dr. Killen:—

"It is a curious fact that the figure of the instrument of torture on which our Lord was put to death, occupied a prominent place among the symbols of the ancient heathen worship. From the most remote antiquity the cross was venerated in Egypt and Syria; it was held in equal honor by the Buddhists of the East; and, what is still more extraordinary, when the Spaniards first visited America, the well-known sign was found among the objects of worship in the idol temples of Anahuac. It is also remarkable that, about the commencement of our era, the pagans were wont to make the sign of a cross upon the forehead in the celebration of some of their sacred mysteries. A satisfactory explanation of the origin of such peculiarities in the ritual of idolatry can now scarcely be expected; but it certainly need not excite surprise if the early Christians were impressed by them, and if they viewed them as so many unintentional testimonies to the truth of their religion. The disciples displayed, indeed, no little ingenuity in their attempts to discover the figure of a cross in almost every object around them. They could recognize it in the trees and

the flowers, in the fishes and the fowls, in the sails of a ship and the structure of the human body; and if they borrowed from their heathen neighbors the custom of making a cross upon the forehead, they would of course be ready to maintain that they thus only redeemed the holy sign from profanation. Some of them were, perhaps, prepared, on prudential grounds, to plead for its introduction. Heathenism was, to a considerable extent, a religion of bowings and genuflections; its votaries were, ever and anon, attending to some little rite or form; and, because of the multitude of these diminutive acts of outward devotion, its ceremonial was at once frivolous and burdensome. When the pagan passed into the church, he, no doubt, often felt, for a time, the awkwardness of the change; and was frequently on the point of repeating, as it were automatically, the gestures of his old superstition. It may, therefore, have been deemed expedient to supersede more objectionable forms by something of a Christian complexion; and the use of the sign of the cross here probably presented itself as an observance equally familiar and convenient. But the disciples would have acted more wisely had they boldly discarded all the puerilities of paganism; for credulity soon began to ascribe supernatural virtue to this vestige of the repudiated worship. As early as the beginning of the third century, it was believed to operate like a charm; and it was accordingly employed on almost all occasions by many of the Christians."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 1, chap. 3, paragraph 5.*

What Dr. Killen says on this point leaves very little room for comment. Of course it must be understood that when Dr. Killen speaks of "the disciples'" seeking to find the sign of the cross in everything in nature, he does not mean those who in the New Testament are called disciples, but the professed Christians of a later day.

On the use of images in connection with the sign of the cross Neander has the following:—

"The use of religious images among the Christians, did not proceed from their ecclesiastical, but from their domestic life. In the intercourse of daily life, the Christians saw themselves everywhere surrounded by objects of heathen mythology, or by such as shocked their moral and Christian feelings. Similar objects adorned the walls of chambers, the drinking vessels, and the signet rings (on which the heathen had constantly idolatrous images), to which, whenever they pleased, they could address their devotions; and the Christians naturally felt themselves obliged to replace these objects, which wounded their moral and religious feelings, with others more suited to those feelings. Therefore, they gladly put the likeness of a shepherd, carrying a lamb upon his shoulders, on their cups, as a symbol of the Redeemer, who saves the sinners that return to him, according to the parable in the gospel. And Clement of Alexandria says, in reference to the signet rings of the Christians, 'Let our signet rings consist of a dove (the emblem of the Holy Ghost); or a fish, or a ship sailing towards heaven (the emblem of the Christian church, or of individual Christian souls); or a lyre (the emblem of Christian joy); or an anchor (the emblem of Christian hope); and he who is a fisherman, let him remember the apostle, and the children who are dragged out from the water; for those men ought not to engrave idolatrous forms, to whom the use of them is forbidden; those can engrave no sword and no bow, who seek for peace; the friends of temperance cannot engrave drinking cups.' And yet, perhaps, religious images made their way from domestic life into the churches, as early as the end of the third century, and the walls of the churches were painted in the same way. . . . It is probable that the visible representation of the cross found its way very early into domestic and ecclesiastical life. This token was remarkably common among them; it was used to consecrate their rising and their going to bed, their going out and their coming in, and all the actions of daily life; it was the sign which Chris-

tians made involuntarily, whenever anything of a fearful nature surprised them. This was a mode of expressing, by means perceptible to the senses, the purely Christian idea, that all the actions of Christians, as well as the whole course of their life, must be sanctified by faith in the crucified Jesus, and by dependence upon him, and that this faith is the most powerful means of conquering all evil, and preserving oneself against it. But here also again, men were apt to confuse the idea and the token which represented it, and they attributed the effects of faith in the crucified Redeemer to the outward sign, to which they ascribed a supernatural, sanctifying, and preservative power; an error of which we find traces as early as the third century."—*Rose's Neander, pp. 183, 184.*

And that is as early as there is any evidence of a growing regard for the Sunday festival. The worship of images and the observance of the Sunday festival came into the church about the same time; but images were regarded with reverence a long time before Sunday was regarded as a sacred day.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (CONTINUED).

CLOSELY connected with the sign of the cross as a preservative against every form of evil, is the use of charms and divinations. This also was practiced by very many of the early Christians. After mentioning the various forms of auguries among the ancients, Bingham says (book 16, chap. 5):—

"The old Romans were much given to these superstitions, insomuch that they had their colleges of augurs, and would neither fight, nor make war or peace, or do anything of moment without consulting them. The squeaking of a rat was sometimes the occasion of dissolving a senate, or making a consul or dictator lay down his office, as begun with an ill omen. Now, though Christianity was a professed enemy to all such vanities, yet the remains of such superstition continued in the hearts of many after their conversion."

"But there was one sort of enchantment, which many ignorant and superstitious Christians, out of the remains of heathen error, much affected; that was the use of charms, and amulets, and spells, to cure diseases, or avert dangers and mischiefs, both from themselves and the fruits of the earth. For Constantine had allowed the heathen, in the beginning of his reformation, for some time, not only to consult their augurs in public, but also to use charms by way of remedy for bodily distempers, and to prevent storms of rain and hail from injuring the ripe fruits, as appears from that very law where he condemns the other sort of magic, that tended to do mischief, to be punished with death. And probably from this in-

dulgence granted to the heathen, many Christians, who brought a tincture of heathenism with them into their religion, might take occasion to think there was no great harm in such charms or enchantments, when the design was only to do good, and not evil."

This custom prevails in the Catholic Church to-day. It is true that Bingham places its introduction into the church this side of the time of Constantine; but from what we have already learned of the superstitious reverence of the cross, and from what we shall yet learn of their devotion to relics, it will be evident to all that the use of charms and divination came into the church as soon as the heathen began to come into it in very great numbers. The reader will notice that all the perversions of gospel ordinances, and all the additions that were made to the number of the ceremonies, were for the purpose of attracting the heathen. This being the case, we would naturally expect that considerable deference would be paid to heathen philosophy, and such we find was the case. Mosheim says:—

"The Christian teachers were well aware of what essential benefit it would be in promoting their cause, not only with the multitude, but also amongst men of the higher orders, could the philosophers, whose authority and estimation with the world was unbounded, be brought to embrace Christianity. With a view, therefore, of accomplishing this desirable object, they not only adopted the study of philosophy themselves, but became loud in their recommendation of it to others, declaring that the difference between Christianity and philosophy was but trifling, and consisted merely in the former being of a nature somewhat more perfect than the latter. And it is most certain that this kind of conduct was so far productive of the desired effect, as to cause not a few of the philosophers to enroll themselves under the Christian

banner. Those who have perused the various works written by such of the ancient philosophers as had been induced to embrace Christianity, cannot have failed to remark, that the Christian discipline was regarded by all of them in no other light than as a certain mode of philosophizing."—*Ecclesiastical Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 26, note 2.*

The writings of Justin Martyr, Clement, Tertullian, and Origen afford ample evidence of this.

Prof. J. H. Pettingell, in "The Gospel of Life in the Syriac New Testament" (p. 9), says:—

"The Christian church came early, after the days of the apostles, under the influence, not merely of the Greek language, but of the philosophy of the Greeks. The tendency in this direction was apparent even in the times of the apostles. It was against this very influence that Paul so often and earnestly warned the early Christians: 'Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, and not after Christ.' 'Avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called, which some professing, have erred concerning the faith.' 'I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve, through his subtility, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.' . . . It was not long before the Grecian philosophy had become dominant and controlling. Their schools of literature, and especially of theology, were Grecian schools. Grecian philosophers became their teachers and leaders."

Prof. George Dunbar, in his Appendix to Potter's "Antiquities of Greece," says of Plato:—

"His opinions were eagerly adopted by many of the first Christian philosophers, and aided them in forming those bold and whimsical theories about the economy of the future world, which injured the simplicity and purity of the Christian faith."

If the reader will refer to what has been written concerning the Greek philosophy and its demoralizing tendency, its highest conception of good being depraved human nature, he will speedily arrive at the conclusion that just to the extent that the study of philosophy,—"science falsely so called,"—was encouraged in the church, to the same extent would heathen superstition and immorality exist in the church, even if such things were not encouraged by any other means.

One of the errors which was brought into the church as the direct result of the study of Greek philosophy, is the doctrine of

PURGATORY AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

Says Killen:—

"The Platonic philosophy taught the necessity of a state of purification after death; and a modification of this doctrine formed part of at least some of the systems of gnosticism. It is inculcated by Tertullian, the great champion of Montanism; and we have seen how, according to Mani, departed souls must pass, first to the moon, and then to the sun, that they may thus undergo a twofold purgation. Here, again, a tenet originally promulgated by the heretics, became at length a portion of the creed of the church. The Manichæans, as well as the gnostics, rejected the doctrine of the atonement, and as faith in the perfection of the cleansing virtue of the blood of Christ declined, a belief in purgatory became popular." —*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 4, paragraph 15.*

Of course an acceptance of the philosophy of Plato, was an acceptance of the heathen dogma of the inherent immortality of the soul, and from that the doctrine of purgatory is a legitimate outgrowth. In the writings of the Fathers themselves, we have already found all these

errors and superstitions plainly taught. See especially Hermas and Tertullian.

Again we quote from Bingham:—

"Next after prayer for kings, followed prayer for the dead, that is, for all that were departed in the true faith in Christ. . . . We have heard Arnobius say already, that they prayed for the living and the dead in general. And long before him Tertullian speaks of oblations for the dead, for their birthdays, that is, the day of their death, or a new birth unto happiness, in their annual commemorations. He says every woman prayed for the soul of her deceased husband, desiring that he might find rest and refreshment at present, and a part in the first resurrection, and offering an annual oblation for him on the day of his death. In like manner he says the husband prayed for the soul of his wife, and offered annual oblations for her. . . . Cyril of Jerusalem [A. D. 315–386], in describing the prayer after consecration, says, We offer this sacrifice in memory of all those that are fallen asleep before us, first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God by their prayers and intercessions may receive our supplications; and then we pray for our holy fathers and bishops, and all that are fallen asleep before us, believing it to be a considerable advantage to their souls to be prayed for, whilst the holy and tremendous sacrifice lies upon the altar."—*Antiquities, book 15, chap. 3.*

When Paul warned the Colossians against being spoiled "through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ," he mentions as connected with it "voluntary humility [asceticism] and worshiping of angels" (demons under the name of departed men), a thing introduced by men "vainly puffed up" by their "fleshly mind." Col. 2:8, 18. Whoever has given the matter any thought, knows that the heathen religion was Spiritualism, and so

when the church became paganized, she assumed a form of Spiritualism; for purgatory, prayers to and for the dead, and the worship of martyrs, are nothing else. This doctrine remains in the Catholic Church to-day; but Protestant denominations have generally repudiated it. Why this ancient dogma of "the church" should be rejected, while others no more ancient, and resting on no better authority, are accepted, we cannot determine. There are some things for which not even "a reasonable creature" can give a reason. But it would seem from the following that in the matter of purgatory, a part, at least, of the ancient church was even more Catholic than Catholicism itself:—

"Many of the ancients believed that there would be a fire of probation, through which all must pass at the last day, even the prophets and apostles, and even the Virgin Mary herself not excepted. Which is asserted not only by Origen, Irenæus, and Lactantius, but also by St. Ambrose, who says after Origen, that all must pass through the flames, though it be John the evangelist, though it be Peter."—*Bingham's Antiquities, book 15, chap. 3.*

"PIOUS" FRAUDS.

Referring again to the testimony which we quoted concerning the kind of morality inculcated by the Greek philosophy, the reader will find that lying was thought to be a virtue, and often to be preferred to truth. When the early Christians accepted the Greek philosophy it was not long before they adopted the heathen maxim that "a lie is better than a hurtful truth," as is proved by the following testimony:—

"The code of heathen morality supplied a ready apology for falsehood, and its accommodating principles soon found too much encouragement within the pale of the

church. Hence the pious frauds which were now perpetrated. Various works made their appearance with the name of some apostolic man appended to them, their fabricators thus hoping to give currency to opinions or to practices which might otherwise have encountered much opposition. At the same time many evinced a disposition to supplement the silence of the written word by the aid of tradition. . . . During this period the uncertainty of any other guide than the inspired record was repeatedly demonstrated; for, though Christians were removed at so short a distance from apostolic times, the traditions of one church sometimes diametrically contradicted those of another."—*Killen's Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 2, chap. 5, paragraph 7.*

It may be allowable to quote also in this place an extract already quoted from Mosheim. It is this:—

"By some of the weaker brethren, in their anxiety to assist God with all their might [in the propagation of the Christian faith], such dishonest artifices were occasionally resorted to, as could not, under any circumstances, admit of excuse, and were utterly unworthy of that sacred cause which they were unquestionably intended to support. Perceiving, for instance, in what vast repute the poetical effusions of those ancient prophetesses, termed Sybils, were held by the Greeks and Romans, some Christian, or rather, perhaps, an association of Christians, in the reign of Antoninus Pius [A. D. 138–161], composed eight books of Sybilline verses, made up of prophecies respecting Christ and his kingdom. . . . Many other deceptions of this sort, to which custom has very improperly given the denomination of *pious* frauds, are known to have been practiced in this and the succeeding century. The authors of them were, in all probability, actuated by no ill intention, but this is all that can be said in their favor, for their conduct in this respect was certainly most ill-advised and unwarrantable. Although the greater part of those who were concerned

in these forgeries on the public, undoubtedly belonged to some heretical sect or other, and particularly to that class which arrogated to itself the pompous denomination of gnostics, I yet cannot take upon me to acquit even the most strictly orthodox from all participation in this species of criminality; for it appears from evidence superior to all exception, that a pernicious maxim, which was current in the schools not only of the Egyptians, the Platonists, and the Pythagoreans, but also of the Jews, was very early recognized by the Christians, and soon found amongst them numerous patrons, namely, that those who made it their business to deceive with a view of promoting the cause of truth, were deserving rather of commendation than censure."—*Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 7.*

He says also that the disputing of the Fathers "had victory rather than truth for its object." If this was done by the teachers in the church, it is easy to imagine what was the prevalent standard; and remember that this was within less than fifty years after the death of the last apostle, so rapidly did the "mystery of iniquity" work. Now there is just as much reason for following the custom of "the early church" in the matter of "pious" frauds as in the matter of substituting Sunday for Sabbath. Both were violations of the decalogue; but the "pious" fraud has the advantage of the other on the score of antiquity, since it was common long before Sunday began to take the place of the Sabbath. People should be consistent; if they are going to adopt one practice of the early church, they should not reject another which stands on the same authority, and which is more ancient.

IMMORALITY IN THE CHURCH.

We have already learned how some, at least, of the

bishops allowed the members of their flocks to emulate in their feasts all the profligacy of the heathen; we are therefore now prepared to believe that no bounds were set to the corruption that was then overwhelming the church. We introduce the testimony by the following mild statement of the case by Killen:—

"There was a traitor among the twelve, and it is apparent from the New Testament that, in the apostolic church, there were not a few unworthy members. 'Many walk,' says Paul, 'of whom I have told you often, and now tell you, even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.' In the second and third centuries the number of such false brethren did not diminish. To those who are ignorant of its saving power, Christianity may commend itself, by its external evidences, as a revelation from God; and many, who are not prepared to submit to its authority, may seek admission to its privileges. The superficial character of much of the evangelism now current appeared in times of persecution; for, on the first appearance of danger, multitudes abjured the gospel, and returned to the heathen superstitions. It is, besides, a fact which cannot be disputed that, in the third century, the more zealous champions of the faith felt it necessary to denounce the secularity of many of the ministers of the church. Before the Decian persecution [A. D. 250] not a few of the bishops were mere worldlings, and such was their zeal for money-making, that they left their parishes neglected, and traveled to remote districts where, at certain seasons of the year, they might carry on a profitable traffic. If we are to believe the testimony of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of the period, crimes were then perpetrated, to which it would be difficult to find anything like parallels in the darkest pages of the history of modern Christianity. The chief pastor of the largest church in the proconsular Africa

tells, for instance, of one of his own presbyters who robbed orphans and defrauded widows, who permitted his father to die of hunger, and treated his pregnant wife with horrid brutality. (Cyprian, *Ad Cornelium*, epis. 49.) Another ecclesiastic, of still higher position, speaks of three bishops in his neighborhood who engaged, when intoxicated, in the solemn rite of ordination. Such excesses were indignantly condemned by all right-hearted disciples, but the fact, that those to whom they were imputed were not destitute of partisans, supplies clear yet melancholy proof that neither the Christian people nor the Christian ministry, even in the third century, possessed an unsullied reputation."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 1, chap. 3, paragraph 2.*

This is not to be wondered at; if it was considered right to lie when contending for the "truth" (!) what could be expected of men in ordinary life? Robinson, in his "Ecclesiastical Researches" (p. 126), as quoted by "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia," art. "Novatian," uses the following language concerning that ecclesiastic and the church in his time:—

"He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the church. Christians within the space of a very few years were caressed by one emperor and persecuted by another. In seasons of prosperity many persons rushed into the church for base purposes. In times of adversity they denied the faith, and reverted again to idolatry. When the squall was over, they came again to the church, with all their vices, to deprave others by their example. The bishops, fond of proselytes, encouraged all this, and transferred the attention of Christians to vain shows at Easter, and other Jewish ceremonies, adulterated too with paganism."

Novatian died about 255 A. D.; therefore the church reached the condition here described less than one hun-

dred and fifty years after the death of the apostle John. Certainly the degradation was rapid enough.

Bingham says:—

"There goes a decree under the name of Pope Eutychian, which makes the habit of drunkenness matter of excommunication to a layman also, till he break off the custom by reformation and amendment. But it must be owned, this vice was sometimes so general and epidemical, that the numbers of transgressors made the exactness of the discipline impracticable. St. Austin complains and laments, that it was so in Africa in his time. Though the apostle had condemned three great and detestable vices in one place, viz., rioting and drunkenness, chambering and wantonness, strife and envying; yet matters were come to that pass with men, that two of the three, drunkenness and strife, were thought tolerable things, whilst wantonness only was esteemed worthy of excommunication; and there was some danger that in a little time the other two might be reputed no vices at all. For rioting and drunkenness was esteemed so harmless and allowable a thing, that men not only practiced it in their own houses every day, but in the memorials of the holy martyrs on solemn festivals, and that in pretended honor to the martyrs also."—*Antiquities of the Christian Church, book 16, chap. 11.*

After quoting what Cyprian (who lived in the early part of the third century) says of the condition of the church, Bingham adds:—

"He was forced to endure these colleagues of his, who were covetous, rapacious, extortioners, usurers, deserters, fraudulent, and cruel. It was impossible to exercise church censures with any good effect, when there were such multitudes both of priests and people ready to oppose them, and distract the church into a thousand schisms, rather than suffer themselves to be curbed or reformed that way."—*Id., chap. 3.*

In another place he gives the following, which shows not only the depravity of the church in the third century, but also how readily Scripture could be manufactured to meet the emergency:—

"If a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, says one of the apostolical canons, be taken in fornication, perjury, or theft, he shall be deposed, but not excommunicated; for the Scripture says, 'Thou shalt not punish twice for the same crime.' [?] And the like rule is prescribed in the canons of Peter, bishop of Alexandria, and those of St. Basil."—*Id., book 17, chap. 1.*

If anything were yet lacking to show how rapidly the church, as a whole, was becoming paganized, even in the third century, the following from Dr. Killen most certainly supplies the lack:—

"Meanwhile the introduction of a false standard of piety created much mischief. It had long been received as a maxim, among certain classes of philosophers, that bodily abstinence is necessary to those who would attain more exalted wisdom; and the Gentile theology, especially in Egypt and the East, had indorsed the principle. It was not without advocates among the Jews, as is apparent from the discipline of the Essenes and the Therapeutæ. At an early period its influence was felt within the pale of the church, and before the termination of the second century, individual members here and there were to be found who eschewed certain kinds of food, and abstained from marriage. The pagan literati, who now joined the disciples in considerable numbers, did much to promote the credit of this adulterated Christianity. Its votaries, who were designated ascetics and philosophers, did not withdraw themselves from the world, but, whilst adhering to their own regimen, still remained mindful of their social obligations. Their self-imposed mortification soon found admirers, and an opinion gradually gained ground that these abstinent disciples culti-

vated a higher form of piety. The adherents of the new discipline silently increased, and by the middle of the third century, a class of females who led a single life, and who, by way of distinction, were called *virgins*, were in some places regarded by the other church-members with special veneration. Among the clergy also celibacy was now considered a mark of superior holiness. But, in various places, pietism about this time assumed a form which disgusted all persons of sober judgment and ordinary discretion. The unmarried clergy and the virgins deemed it right to cultivate the communion of saints after a new fashion, alleging that, in each others' society, they enjoyed peculiar advantages for spiritual improvement. It was not, therefore, uncommon to find a single ecclesiastic and one of the sisterhood of virgins dwelling in the same house and sharing the same bed! All the while the parties repudiated the imputation of any improper intercourse, but in some cases the proofs of profligacy were too plain to be concealed, and common sense refused to credit the pretensions of such an absurd and suspicious spiritualism. The ecclesiastical authorities felt it necessary to interfere, and compel the professed virgins and the single clergy to abstain from a degree of intimacy which was unquestionably not free from the appearance of evil."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 1, chap. 3, paragraph 3.*

If the reader will turn back to pages 90 and 91, he will there find that the "Shepherd of Hermas," which was regarded as an inspired production, was responsible for this vile practice. The heathen Christians of the early centuries were apt pupils of this "bad master in morals."

Vice is the next neighbor to fanaticism; that excessive zeal for virtue, which leads men to despise and reject that which the Lord has instituted and declared honorable, is as sure to end in immorality as is open con-

tempt of all moral law. Henry Charles Lea, in his "History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages," says that the practice of unnatural lusts "was a prevalent vice of the Middle Ages, and one to which monastic communities were especially subject" (vol. 3, p. 255), and he quotes as follows from Nicholas de Clemangis, a Catholic writer of the fourteenth century, and secretary to Pope Benedict XIII.:—

"As for monks, they specially avoid all to which their vows oblige them—chastity, poverty, and obedience—and are licentious and undisciplined vagabonds. The mendicants, who pretend to make amends for the neglect of duty by the secular clergy, are Pharisees, and wolves in sheep's clothing. With incredible eagerness and infinite deceit they seek everywhere for temporal gain; they abandon themselves beyond all other men to the pleasures of the flesh, feasting and drinking, and polluting all things with their burning lusts. As for the nuns, modesty forbids the description of the nunneries, which are mere brothels; so that to take the veil is equivalent to becoming a public prostitute."—*History of the Inquisition, vol. 3, pp. 630, 631.*

And this state of things has always existed to the same degree that ascetic fanaticism has existed.

Dr. Schaff certainly cannot be accused of lack of respect for early traditions, yet he makes the following general statement concerning the first three centuries of the church's existence:—

"The Christian life of the period before Constantine has certainly been often unwarrantably idealized. In a human nature essentially the same, we could but expect all sorts of the same faults and excrescences, which we found even in the apostolic churches. The epistles of Cyprian afford incontestable evidence, that, especially in the intervals of repose, an abatement of zeal soon showed

itself, and, on the re-opening of persecution, the Christian name was dishonored by whole hosts of apostates. And not seldom did the most prominent virtues, courage in death, and strictness of morals, degenerate to morbid fanaticism and unnatural rigor."—*History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, sec. 87.*

The growth of asceticism can be traced through the writings of the Fathers; and the following from Mosheim, touching upon the point, gives a brief outline of all that we have noted in the history of the church, and prepares the way for the last feature that we design to consider:—

"Those idle fictions, which a regard for the Platonic philosophy and for the prevailing opinions of the day had induced most theologians to embrace even before the times of Constantine, were now in various ways confirmed, extended, and embellished. Hence it is that we see, on every side, evident traces of excessive veneration for departed saints, of a purifying fire for souls when separated from the body, of the celibacy of the clergy, of the worship of images and relics, and of many other opinions, which in process of time almost banished the true religion, or at least very much obscured and corrupted it.

"Genuine piety was supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which originated partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites, and combine them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind in general for a splendid and ostentatious religion. At first, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs; as if, thence men could bear away the radical principles of holiness, and certain hopes of salvation. Next, from Palestine and from places venerated for their sanctity, portions of dust or of earth were brought; as if they were the most powerful protection against the assaults of evil spirits; and these were bought and sold everywhere at great prices. Further, the public supplications by

which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated in due form, and to the images of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed and the same privileges assigned as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues, and lustrations, before the advent of Christ. Images indeed were as yet but rare, and statues did not exist. And shameful as it may appear, it is beyond all doubt, that the worship of the martyrs,—with no bad intentions indeed, yet to the great injury of the Christian cause,—was modeled by degrees into conformity with the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods. From these specimens the intelligent reader will be able to conceive how much injury resulted to Christianity from the peace and repose procured by Constantine and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the pagans to embrace this religion."

"This unenlightened piety of the common people opened a wide door to the endless frauds of persons who were base enough to take advantage of the ignorance and errors of others, disingenuously to advance their own interests. Rumors were artfully disseminated of prodigies and wonders to be seen in certain edifices and places (a trick before this time practiced by the pagan priests), whereby the infatuated populace were drawn together, and the stupidity and ignorance of those who looked upon everything new and unusual as a miracle, were often wretchedly imposed upon. Graves of saints and martyrs were supposed to be where they were not; the list of saints was enriched with fictitious names; and even robbers were converted into martyrs. Some buried blood-stained bones in retired places, and then gave out that they had been informed in a dream, that the corpse of some friend of God was there interred. Many, especially of the monks, traveled through the different provinces, and not only shamelessly carried on a traffic in fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude

with ludicrous combats with evil spirits. It would require a volume to detail the various impositions which were, for the most part successfully, practiced by artful knaves, after genuine piety and true religion were compelled to resign their dominion in great measure to superstition."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 2, cent. 4, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 1–3.*

Let not the reader imagine that this was Christianity, although it bore that name. There is no reason whatever in the infidel charges that are brought against Christianity, because of the conduct of the apostate church. Everybody recognizes the truthfulness of the saying that "all is not gold that glitters." But in the days of which we are writing there was not even the glitter of the gold of Christianity. In its stead there was only the tinsel of paganism. But it must not be supposed that there were no Christians at that time. There were true Christians, but their history is not accessible at present. They were of little repute, for they were of the class "of whom the world was not worthy," and so their history is preserved only in the records of "the church of the First-born," in Heaven.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (CONTINUED).

RELIC AND MARTYR WORSHIP.

THE last particular which we design to notice in the downward course of the church, is the introduction of various heathen festival days. But as no error ever stands alone, reference will necessarily be made in connection with it to martyr and relic worship. It is a matter of no little interest to trace the course of error. The early Christians accepted the Platonic philosophy; this led to the exaltation of the human, and the corresponding depreciation of the divine; and as a natural consequence, the pagan notion of the natural immortality of the soul was adopted. From this point it was but a step to the doctrine of purgatory. The heathen philosophy deified departed heroes, and it was but natural that the professed Christians who imbibed that philosophy should in a measure deify those who in their life-time had borne a reputation for exalted piety. The only difference between the pagan and the Christian deification of men was that the pagans called their departed heroes gods; while the Christians, who acknowledged only one God, called their departed heroes "saints." Instead of allowing that all righteous people are saints, they gave the title of saint to only a few of those whom they believed were saved.

This distinction of "saints" and ordinarily righteous persons, prepared the way for the worship of "saints,"

just as the heathen worshiped their demigods. For, they reasoned, since all the good are saved, it must be that the "saints" would have been saved if they had not been so good as they were; that is, they were actually better than the Lord wanted them to be, and consequently they must have accumulated a lot of good works which they do not need, and which they can impart to men in the flesh. Thus the honor that belongs to Christ alone, was bestowed upon men. The doctrine of works of supererogation occurs in several of the Fathers.

But no one thought that the "saints" could accumulate this treasury of extra good works simply by ordinary goodness. The humble peasant who faithfully discharged the duties of life, unnoticed by any save God, whose approbation was all he craved, could never attain to the rank of a "saint." Such a life would barely suffice to gain one an entrance into Heaven. He who would be a "saint," must endure long fasts; he must scourge himself; he must mortify the body in order that he might purify the soul; he must go on long pilgrimages, and perform some wonderful work. The "neglecting of the body" was an essential characteristic of a Catholic "saint." The ascetic who should take a bath might possibly get to Heaven, but he would lose all claims to saintship. The more filthy he was in his habits, the more his sanctity was supposed to be increased.

The church historian, Socrates, relates a circumstance which shows not only the character of the so-called "saints," but also the senseless superstition of their admirers, and how much trust was placed in relics. Writing of Theodosius II. he says:—

"His piety was such that he had a reverential regard

for all who were consecrated to the service of God; and honored in an especial manner those whom he knew to be eminent for their sanctity of life. The bishop of Chebron having died at Constantinople, the emperor is reported to have expressed a wish to have his cassock of sackcloth of hair, which, although it was excessively filthy, he wore as a cloak, hoping that thus he should become a partaker in some degree of the sanctity of the deceased." —*Ecclesiastical History, book 7, chap. 22.*

Whether the emperor partook of the sanctity of the saint, or not, there can be little doubt that by wearing the cassock he acquired at least the "odor of sanctity." This circumstance, which is related by the historian as an evidence of the emperor's superior piety, shows that in the fifth century (when Socrates flourished) superstition had fairly taken the place of religion in the church. But long before this time, martyr worship had found a place in the church, as the following extracts will show:—

"We cannot, however, deny, that in the time of Cyprian [about A. D. 250], and even earlier, the seeds of an exaggerated honor to the martyrs, which had consequences prejudical to the purity of Christianity, showed themselves."—*Neander's Church History (Rose's translation) p. 214.*

Dr. Schaff (History of the Christian Church, sec. 59) says:—

"The day of the death of a martyr was called his heavenly birthday, and was celebrated annually at his grave (mostly in a cave or catacomb), by prayer, reading of a history of his suffering and victory, oblations, and celebration of the holy supper.

"But the early church did not stop with this. Martyrdom was taken, after the end of the second century, not only as a higher grade of Christian virtue, but at the same time as a baptism of fire and blood, an ample substi-

tution for the baptism of water, as purifying from sin, and as securing an entrance into Heaven."

"The veneration thus shown for the persons of the martyrs was transferred in smaller measure to their remains. The church of Smyrna counted the bones of Polycarp more precious than gold or diamonds. The remains of Ignatius were held in equal veneration by the Christians at Antioch. The friends of Cyprian gathered his blood in handkerchiefs, and built a chapel over his tomb."

Writing of the fourth century, concerning new objects of worship, the church historian Gieseler says:—

"Martyrdom, which presented so strong a contrast to the lukewarmness of the present time, was the more highly venerated in proportion to its remoteness. The heathen converts naturally enough transferred to the martyrs the honors they had been accustomed to pay their heroes. This took place the more readily as the scrupulous aversion to excessive veneration of the creature died away in the church after the victory over heathenism; and the despotic form of government became accustomed to a slavish respect for the powerful. Thus the old custom of holding meetings for public worship at the graves of the martyrs now gave occasion to the erection of altars and churches over them. In Egypt, the Christians, following an old popular custom, began to preserve the corpses of men reputed to be saints, in their houses; and while the idea of communion with the martyrs was always increasingly associated with the vicinity of their mortal remains, the latter were drawn forth from their graves and placed in the churches, especially under the altars. Thus respect for the martyrs received a sensuous object to center itself on, and became in consequence more extravagant and superstitious. To the old idea of the efficacy of the martyr's intercession, was now added the belief, that it was possible to communicate the desires to them directly; an opinion partly founded

on the popular notion that departed souls still hovered about the bodies they had once inhabited; partly on the high views entertained of the glorified state of the martyrs who abide only with the Lord. As Origen first laid the foundation of this new kind of respect for martyrs, so the Origenists were the first who addressed them in their sermons, as if they were present, and besought their intercession. But though the orators were somewhat extravagant in this respect, the poets, who soon after seized upon the same theme, found no colors too strong to describe the power and glory of the martyrs. Even relics soon began to work miracles, and to become valuable articles of commerce on this account, like the old heathen instruments of magic."

"Martyrs before unknown announced themselves also in visions; others revealed the places where their bodies were buried. Till the fifth century, prayers had been offered even for the dead saints; but at that time the practice was discontinued as unsuitable. It is true that the more enlightened Fathers of the church insisted on a practical imitation of the saints in regard to morality as the most important thing in the new saint worship, nor were exhortations to address prayer directly to God also wanting; but yet the people attributed the highest value to the intercession of the saints whose efficacy was so much prized. Many heathen customs were incorporated with this saint worship. Churches, under whose altars their bodies rested, were dedicated to their worship. As gods and heroes were formerly chosen for patrons, so patron-saints were now selected."—*Ecclesiastical History, period 2, division 1, chap. 5, sec. 99.*

A previous quotation from Mosheim (see page 247) has shown us how the Christians often celebrated these "birthdays" of the martyrs. Of the incomparable benefits supposed to be derived from martyrdom, the reader has already had an opportunity to learn from the epistles of Ignatius.

On this same subject Mosheim says:—

"Both martyrs and confessors* were looked upon as being full of the Holy Spirit, and as acting under an immediate divine inspiration. . . . Whatever might have been the sins and offenses of the martyrs, it was imagined that they were all atoned for and washed away by their own blood, not by that of Christ. Being thus restored to a state of absolute purity and innocence, it was conceived that they were taken directly up into Heaven, and admitted to a share in the divine councils and administration; that they sat as judges with God, enjoying the highest marks of his favor, and possessing influence sufficient to obtain from him whatever they might make the object of their prayers. . . . Those who had acquired the title of confessors were maintained at the public expense, and were on every occasion treated with the utmost reverence. The interests and concerns of the different religious assemblies to which they belonged were, for the most part, consigned to their care and management;—insomuch, indeed, that they might almost be termed the very souls of their respective churches. Whenever the office of bishop or presbyter became vacant, they were called to it as a matter of right, in preference to everyone else, although there might be others superior to them in point of talents and abilities. Out of the exceedingly high opinion that was entertained of the sanctity and exalted character of the martyrs, at length sprung up the notion that their relics possessed a divine virtue, efficacious in counteracting or remedying any ills to which either our souls or bodies may be exposed. From the same source arose the practice of imploring their assistance and intercession in cases of doubt or adversity, as also that of erecting statues to their memory, and paying to these images divine worship; in fine, to such an height of vicious excess was this veneration for the martyrs carried, that the Christians

*"Confessors" were those who had confessed Christ before the magistrate, but who for some reason had escaped being put to death.

came at last to manifest their reverence for these champions of the faith by honors nearly similar to those which the heathens of old were accustomed to pay to their demi-gods and heroes."—*Ecclesiastical Commentaries, cent. 1, sec. 32, note 2.*

There is one other charge that we have to bring against the early church, and we shall introduce it by repeating a quotation already made from the preface to Killen's "Ancient Church:"—

"In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed its aspect. The bishop of Rome—a personage unknown to the writers of the New Testament—meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of divine institutions."

SUNDAY AND CHRISTMAS.

Quite a number of customs that "crept silently into use and then claimed the rank of divine institutions" have already been noted, and there are still others; but the one which has obtained the strongest foothold, and whose false claim to the rank of a divine institution is most generally allowed, is the Sunday. We shall, in the course of our investigation, have the benefit of the best evidence that history has to offer in its behalf, and therefore begin with the following oft-quoted testimony of Mosheim:—

"The Christians of this century [the first], assembled for the worship of God and for their advancement in piety, on the first day of the week, the day on which Christ re-assumed his life; for that this day was set apart for religious worship by the apostles themselves, and that,

after the example of the church of Jerusalem, it was generally observed, we have unexceptionable testimony."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 4.*

Without doubt thousands have had their questionings as to the correctness of Sunday observance quieted by this brief statement by Dr. Mosheim; and many will think it a presumptuous thing to class Sunday among the institutions introduced without divine authority. But it will do no harm to investigate its claims. We shall find that when Mosheim penned the words just quoted he wrote as a churchman and not as a historian. When he writes on matters purely historical, we, in common with all Protestants, accept his testimony as reliable. He drew his information from sources that are accessible to comparatively few, and we accept him as a faithful transcriber of what he found. But when he says of Sunday that it was set apart for religious worship "by the apostles themselves," he is upon ground where even the unlearned may safely challenge him. The New Testament is the only source of information as to what the apostles did, and that contains not a word about the setting apart of Sunday by the apostles or by anybody else.

If it were true, as Mosheim says, that the observance of Sunday was sanctioned by divine authority, a child fourteen years of age could read the evidence from the New Testament just as readily as could a doctor of divinity; and in that case Sunday-keepers would, without hesitation, refer to the Scripture record for the authority for their practice. We should then find no such testimony as the following:—

"Some plant the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] squarely on the fourth commandment, which was an explicit injunction to observe Saturday, and no other day, as a 'holy day unto the Lord.' So some have tried to build the observance of Sunday upon apostolic command, whereas the apostles gave no command on the matter at all. . . . The truth is, so soon as we appeal to the *litera scripta* [the plain text] of the Bible, the Sabbatarians have the best of the argument."—*Christian at Work, April 19, 1883.*

In the same strain is the following from an article by Dr. Charles S. Robinson, in the *Sunday School Times* of January 14, 1882:—

"It is not wise to base the entire Sabbath [Sunday] argument on the fourth precept of the decalogue. . . . We shall become perplexed, if we attempt to rest our case on simple legal enactment. Our safety in such discussions consists in our fastening attention upon the gracious and benevolent character of the divine institution."

That is to say, there is no trace of a divine command for Sunday observance, and therefore when people ask for something definite, something upon which they can depend, their minds must be diverted by a pleasing fiction, so that they may not discover the truth. Is there not in this something akin to the "pious" fraud?

Lastly, we quote again from the *Christian at Work*:—

"We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that while the Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture, it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic times for the establishment of Sunday observance."—*Christian at Work, 1884.*

The fact that nearly a century and a half after Mosheim wrote his history, editors of religious journals

devoted to the Sunday-Sabbath should feel obliged to make such admissions as those just quoted, should be accepted as evidence that the Bible affords no authority for the keeping of Sunday. We are not concerned to show that Sunday was not observed to some extent very early in the Christian era. We are willing to give it a place with "pious" frauds, purgatory, relic and "saint" worship, etc.; our only point is that, like the things just mentioned, it has no divine sanction. When it is once admitted that the designation of Sunday as a Sabbath rests solely on the authority of "the church" (and that is where all Sunday argument finally ends) the Sabbatarian has only the simple task of showing how much the "custom of the church" is worth. From the testimonies already cited he will have no difficulty in showing that it is worth nothing. The testimony yet to be given will make this still more evident.

Now that we have shown from the advocates of Sunday observance that the practice finds no sanction in either the precept or the practice of the apostles, but that "we must go to later than apostolic times for the establishment of Sunday observance," we may consider ourselves justified in classing Sunday among those institutions which "crept silently into use." The testimony of the Rev. Dr. Scott, the eminent commentator, seems to have been intended expressly for the purpose of establishing this point. He says:—

"The change, from the seventh to the first, appears to have been gradually and *silently* introduced, by example rather than by express precept."—*Comment on Acts 20: 7.*

The following, also, from the *Christian at Work* of

January 8, 1885, will be a good thing to keep in mind:—

"We rest the designation of Sunday [as a sacred day] on the church having 'set it apart of its own authority.' The seventh-day rest was commanded in the fourth commandment. . . . The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis *and none other* does the Christain Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest."

The setting apart of Sunday by the church, "of its own authority," consisted in "gradually and silently" falling into a heathen custom; but why this custom should be perpetuated, while others that rest on the same authority are rejected, is one of the things for which not even an excuse can be given.

While Mosheim's statement concerning the observance of Sunday is very extensively quoted, there is something in the immediate connection which we have never seen quoted by first-day writers. It is the following:—

"Moreover, those congregations which either lived intermingled with Jews, or were composed in great measure of Jews, were accustomed also to observe the seventh day of the week, as a sacred day, for doing which the other Christians *taxed them with no wrong.* As to annual religious days, they appear to have observed two; the one, in memory of Christ's resurrection; the other, in commemoration of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles. To these may be added, those days on which holy men met death for Christ's sake; which, it is most probable, were sacred and solemn days, from the very commencement of the Christian church."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap 4, sec. 4.*

This is from the same section as the other, and immediately follows it. Here we find that the memorial days

of the martyrs have as much claim upon us as Sunday has, for they have an equal place in the customs of the church; but that they were of apostolic origin we think few will allow. Note 4 to the above quotation from Mosheim says:—

"Perhaps, also (Good Friday), the Friday on which our Saviour died, was, from the earliest times, regarded with more respect than other days of the week."

Just as is stated in the "Catholic Christian Instructed," "Sundays and holy days all stand upon the same foundation, namely, the authority of the church."

In harmony with what Mosheim has said, that the seventh day of the week was also observed as a sacred day, Bingham says:—

"Saturday also, or the Sabbath, in every week was observed as a religious festival in many churches. And therefore on this day likewise they generally received the communion. . . . I have already produced the several testimonies of these writers at large upon another occasion, and therefore it is sufficient here to make a brief reference to them. By all this it appears undeniably, that in many churches they had the communion four times every week, on Wednesdays, Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays, besides incidental festivals, which were very frequent, for, as Chrysostom tells us, there was scarce a week passed in the year but they had one or two commemorations of martyrs."—*Antiquities, book 15, chap. 9.*

Concerning the seventh day of the week he again says:—

"Next to the Lord's day the ancient Christians were very careful in the observation of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was the ancient Jewish Sabbath. Some observed it as a fast, others as a festival; but all unanimously agreed in keeping it as a more solemn day of religious worship and adoration."

"Other authors are more particular in describing the religious service of this day; and so far as concerns public worship, they make it in all things conformable to that of the Lord's day; which is a further evidence of its being a festival."—*Id., book 20, chap. 3.*

We do not quote this testimony concerning the Sabbath in the early church, with the idea of thereby strengthening the Sabbath argument. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is all the authority needed for the observance of the seventh day. If all the world kept that day it would not be one whit more sacred, and if it were universally violated by mankind, its sacredness would be just as great as when in Eden the Lord blessed and sanctified it. But the evidence in regard to Sunday would not be complete if we omitted to mention the Sabbath. As Dr. Scott said, Sunday observance came in "gradually and silently," and that would indicate that the Sabbath was as gradually and silently robbed of its rightful honor by the church. It was not until after Constantine had made Sunday a legal holiday (A. D. 321), and the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 343–381) had forbidden Christians to observe the "Jewish Sabbath," that Sunday may be said to have fairly usurped the place which the Sabbath had formerly occupied in the church. But even in this council, allegiance to the Sunday was carried no further than to enact that Christians "shall, if possible, do no work on that day." (See Hefele's History of the Church Councils, vol. 2, p. 316; also McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, art. Sunday.) There has never been a time, however, when there were not Christians who observed the Sabbath of the Lord, but they were, of course, after the above-men-

tioned council, regarded by "the church" as heretics.

Lest some should feel too much elated over the fact that at the time of the Council of Laodicea, the church, as a whole, was observing Sunday, it may not be amiss to state that it was the twenty-ninth canon, or rule, of the council which forbade Sabbath-keeping, and that the thirtieth canon forbade Christian men, *especially the clergy*, from promiscuous bathing with women! Doubtless such a prohibition was necessary, or the council would not have made it; but the fact that Sunday was quite generally observed in a church where such a prohibition was necessary, will hardly be an addition to its prestige.

Concerning public worship, Mosheim, writing of the third century, says:—

"All the monuments of this century which have come down to us, show that there was a great increase of ceremonies. To the causes heretofore mentioned, may be added the passion for Platonic philosophy, or rather, the popular superstition of the oriental nations respecting demons, which was adopted by the Platonists, and received from them by the Christian doctors. For from these opinions concerning the nature and the propensities of evil spirits, many of these rites evidently took their rise."

"That the Christians now had in most provinces certain edifices in which they assembled for religious worship, will be denied by no candid and impartial person. Nor would I contend strenuously, against those who think these edifices were frequently adorned with images and other ornaments. As to the forms of public worship, and the times set apart for it, it is unnecessary here to be particular, as little alteration was made in this century. Yet two things deserve notice. First, the public discourses to the people underwent a change. For not to mention Origen, who was the first so far as we know that made long discourses in public, and in his discourses ex-

pounded the sacred volume, there were certain bishops, who being educated in the schools of the rhetoricians, framed their addresses and exhortations according to the rules of Grecian eloquence, and their example met the most ready approbation. Secondly, the use of incense was now introduced, at least into many churches. Very learned men have denied this fact; but they do it in the face of testimony which is altogether unexceptionable."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 3, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 1, 2.*

In a note to the above, Von Einem says:—.

"The regular seasons for public worship were all Sundays, Good Friday, Easter and Whitsunday. The anniversaries of the local martyrdoms were also observed."

Schlegel, in another note to the above, says:—

"The Christians originally abhorred the use of incense in public worship, as being a part of the worship of idols. Yet they permitted its use at funerals, against offensive smells. Afterwards it was used at the induction of magistrates and bishops, and also in public worship, to temper the bad air of crowded assemblies in hot countries, and at last it degenerated into a superstitious rite."

If, after all that has been given concerning the customs of the early church, the reader feels that the authority of the church is sufficient ground to warrant his continued observance of Sunday, there is still another "holy day" which he must by no means disregard, and that is Christmas.

Concerning the origin of Christmas, "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia" has the following:—

"The observance of Christmas is not of divine appointment, nor is it of New Testament origin. The day of Christ's birth cannot be ascertained from the New Testament, or, indeed, from any other source. The Fathers of

the first three centuries do not speak of any special observance of the nativity. . . . 'The institution may be sufficiently explained by the circumstance that it was the taste of the age to multiply festivals, and that the analogy of other events in our Saviour's history, which had already been marked by a distinct celebration, may naturally have pointed out the propriety of marking his nativity with the same honored distinction. It was celebrated with all the marks of respect usually bestowed on high festivals, and distinguished also by the custom, derived probably from heathen antiquity, of interchanging presents and making entertainments.' At the same time, the heathen winter holidays (*Saturnalia, Juvenalia, Brumalia*) were undoubtedly transformed, and, so to speak, sanctified by the establishment of the Christmas cycle of holidays; and the heathen customs, so far as they were harmless (*e. g.*, the giving of presents, lighting of tapers, etc), were brought over into Christian use."

"Chambers' Encyclopedia" gives the following account of the origin of Christmas:—

"It does not appear, however, that there was any uniformity in the period of observing the nativity among the early churches; some held the festival in the month of May or April, others in January. It is, nevertheless, almost certain that the 25th of December cannot be the nativity of the Saviour, for it is then the height of the rainy season in Judea, and shepherds could hardly be watching their flocks by night in the plains."

"Not casually or arbitrarily was the festival of the nativity celebrated on the 25th of December. Among the causes that co-operated in fixing this period as the proper one, perhaps the most powerful was, that almost all the heathen nations regarded the winter solstice as a most important point of the year, as the beginning of the renewed life and activity of the powers of nature, and of the gods, who were originally merely the symbolical personifications of these. In more northerly countries, this

fact must have made itself peculiarly palpable—hence the Celts and Germans, from the oldest times, celebrated the season with the greatest festivities. At the winter solstice the German held their great Yule-feast, in commemoration of the return of the fiery sun-wheel; and believed that, during the twelve nights reaching from the 25th of December to the 6th January, they could trace the personal movements and interferences on earth of their great deities, Odin, Berchta, etc. Many of the beliefs and usages of the old Germans, and also of the Romans, relating to this matter, passed over from heathenism to Christianity, and have partly survived to the present day."

Prof. J. G. Müller, the author of the article on the worship of the sun, in the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," after mentioning that the sun was worshiped by the Persians, under the form of Mithras, which finally became the *Sol Deus Invictus* of the Romans, says:—

"The Mithras-worship even exercised its influence upon the fixing of the Christian Christmas festival in December. As the new birth of the sun-god was celebrated at the end of December, so, likewise, in Christ the new sun in the field of spiritual life was adored."

And the "Encyclopedia Britannica," after mentioning the obscurity in which the origin of the Christmas festival rests, proceeds thus:—

"By the fifth century, however, whether from the influence of some tradition, or from the desire to supplant heathen festivals of that period of the year, such as the *Saturnalia*, the 25th of December had been generally agreed upon."

Bingham gives the following account of the "Christian" method of keeping this heathen festival:—

"As to the manner of keeping this festival, we may observe, they did it with the greatest veneration. For they

always speak of it in the highest terms, as the principal festival of Christians, from which all others took their original. Chrysostom styles it the most venerable and tremendous of all festivals, and the metropolis or mother of all festivals. . . . And we may observe, that the day was kept with the same veneration and religious solemnity as the Lord's day. . . . Neither did they let this day ever pass without a solemn communion."

"Finally, to show all possible honor to this day, the church obliged all persons to frequent religious assemblies in the city churches, and not go to any of the lesser churches in the country, except some necessity of sickness or infirmity compelled them so to do. And the laws of the State prohibited all public games and shows on this day, as on the Lord's day."—*Book 20, chap. 4.*

We seldom see statements of this character quoted by first-day writers; but people who "rest the designation of Sunday on the church having set it apart of its own authority," should certainly keep Christmas more strictly than they do Sunday, for so did "the church."

The same author says of the festivals adopted from the heathen into the Christian church:—

"As to those festivals which were purely civil, we are to observe that some of them were of long standing in the Roman Empire, and no new institution of Christians, but only reformed and regulated by them in some particulars, to cut off the idolatrous rites and other corruptions that sometimes attended them."—*Antiquities, book 20, chap. 1.*

That Sunday was one of these festivals of long standing among all the ancient heathen, and that its adoption by the Christian church was the adoption of heathenism, will be clearly shown in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (CONTINUED).

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY.

WE have already seen that in the adoption of the Christmas festival the ancient church allied itself with heathen sun-worship. We shall now proceed to show how, in the adoption of the Sunday festival, the church as a body became paganized, and reached the lowest depth of apostasy. To do this, it will be necessary briefly to trace the worship of the sun from ancient times.

That the worship of the sun was the most abominable form of heathenism, is evident from the words of the Lord to the prophet Ezekiel. While the prophet was with the captives in Babylon, he was taken in vision to Jerusalem, and shown the abominable deeds of the Jews who still remained in that city. He was first shown the "image of jealousy" at the door of the inner court of the temple, and the Lord said to him: "Seest thou what they do? even the great abominations that the house of Israel committeth here, that I should go far off from my sanctuary? but turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations." Eze. 8:6.

Then he was shown "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall" of the temple, and seventy elders offering incense, and was again told that he should see even greater abominations.

Next he was brought to the door of the temple, and there saw the women "weeping for Tammuz," the Babylonian Adonis, whose worship was conducted with the most lascivious rites, but was told that he should be shown greater abominations still. These last and greatest abominations are thus described:—

"And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east; and they worshiped the sun toward the east." Verse 16.

From this we must conclude that the worship of the sun was regarded by the Lord as the most abominable form of idolatry. We shall see the reason for this, as we trace the nature and extent of sun-worship. In the *Old Testament Student*, January, 1886, there appeared a valuable article by Talbot W. Chambers, D. D., entitled, "Sun Images and the Sun of Righteousness," to which we shall make frequent reference in this study. The testimony of Dr. Chambers is that the worship of the sun is "the oldest, the most widespread, and the most enduring of all the forms of idolatry known to man." He continues:—

"The universality of this form of idolatry is something remarkable. It seems to have prevailed everywhere. The chief object of worship among the Syrians was Baal —the sun, considered as the giver of light and life, the most active agent in all the operations of nature. But as he sometimes revealed himself as a destroyer, drying up the earth with summer heats and turning gardens into deserts, he was in that view regarded with terror, and appeased with human sacrifices. . . . In Egypt

the sun was the kernel of the State religion. In various forms he stood at the head of each hierarchy. At Memphis he was worshiped as Phtah, at Heliopolis as Tum, at Thebes as Amun Ra. Personified by Osiris, he became the foundation of the Egyptian metempsychosis."

"In Babylon the same thing is observed as in Egypt. Men were struck by the various stages of the daily and yearly course of the sun, in which they saw the most imposing manifestation of Deity. But they soon came to confound the creature with the Creator, and the host of heaven became objects of worship, with the sun as chief. . . . In Persia the worship of Mithra, or the sun, is known to have been common from an early period. No idols were made, but the inscriptions show ever-recurring symbolic representations, usually a disk or orb with outstretched wings, with the addition sometimes of a human figure. The leading feature of the Magian rites derived from ancient Media was the worship of fire, performed on altars erected upon high mountains, where a perpetual flame, supposed to have been originally kindled from Heaven, was constantly watched, and where solemn services were daily rendered. The remnant of the ancient Persians who escaped subjugation by Islam, now known as Parsees, unite with their reverence for the holy fire equal reverence for the sun as the emblem of Ormuzd."

The "Encyclopedia Britannica" (art. Baal) has the following concerning sun-worship in ancient Assyria:—

"The Baal of the Syrians, Phœnicians, and heathen Hebrews is a much less elevated conception than the Babylonian Bel. He is properly the sun-god Baal-Shamem, Baal (lord) of the heavens, the highest of the heavenly bodies, but still a mere power of nature, born like the other luminaries from the primitive chaos. As the sun-god he is conceived as the male principle of life and reproduction in nature, and thus in some forms of his worship is the patron of the grossest sensu-

ality, and even of systematic prostitution. An example of this is found in the worship of Baal-Peor (Numbers 25), and in general in the Canaanitish high places, where Baal, the male principle, was worshiped in association with the unchaste goddess Ashera, the female principle of nature. The frequent references to this form of religion in the Old Testament are obscured in the English version by the rendering 'grove' for the word Ashera, which sometimes denotes the goddess, sometimes the tree or post which was her symbol. Baal himself was represented on the high places not by an image, but by obelisks or pillars (*Maççeboth* E. V. wrongly '*images*'), sometimes called *chammanim* or sun pillars, a name which is to be compared with the title Baal-Chamman, frequently given to the god on Phœnician inscriptions."

Concerning Ashtoreth, or Astarte, the female counterpart of Baal, Prof. George Rawlinson says:—

"The especial place of her worship in Phœnicia was Sidon. In one of her aspects she represented the moon, and bore the head of a heifer with horns curving in a crescent form, whence she seems to have been sometimes called Ashtoreth Karnaim, or, 'Astarte of the two horns.' But, more commonly, she was a nature goddess, 'the great mother,' the representation of the female principle in nature, and hence presiding over the sexual relation, and connected more or less with love and with voluptuousness. The Greeks regarded their Aphorodité, and the Romans their Venus, as her equivalent. One of her titles was, 'Queen of Heaven,' and under this title she was often worshiped by the Israelites."—*Religions of the Ancient World (John B. Alden), pp. 106, 107.*

Enough has already been given to show why sun-worship was so great an abomination. It was simply the worship of the reproductive function. All the sun images had an obscene signification. While Baal, among the Assyrians, was the emblem of the generative power of

the sun, and was worshiped by lascivious rites, Moloch was the emblem of the destructive heat of the sun, and so human sacrifices were offered to him. The prohibitions laid upon the Israelites, against making their children pass through the fire, were simply injunctions against this cruel form of sun-worship.

Professor Rawlinson has the following, concerning sun-worship in Egypt:—

"Ra was the Egyptian sun-god, and was especially worshiped at Heliopolis [city of the sun]. Obelisks, according to some, represented his rays, and were always, or usually, erected in his honor. Heliopolis was certainly one of the places which were thus adorned, for one of the few which still stand erect in Egypt is on the site of that city. The kings for the most part considered Ra their special patron and protector; nay, they went so far as to identify themselves with him, to use his titles as their own, and to adopt his name as the ordinary prefix to their own names and titles. This is believed by many to have been the origin of the word Pharaoh, which was, it is thought, the Hebrew rendering of Ph' Ra—'the sun.'"—*Ib., p. 20.*

Those who have seen the obelisk in Central Park, New York, which was brought from Egypt a few years ago, have had the privilege of beholding one of the ancient sun images. What those sun images signified, we shall have to leave the reader to imagine from what has already been said about the nature of sun-worship.

On page 21, Rawlinson says: "No part of the Egyptian religion was so much developed and so multiplex as their sun worship. Besides Ra and Osiris there were at least six other deities who had a distinctly solar character." Concerning Osiris, the "Encyclopedia Britannica" (art. Egypt), says:—

"Abydos was the great seat of the worship of Osiris, which spread all over Egypt, establishing itself in a remarkable manner at Memphis. All the mysteries of the Egyptians, and their whole doctrine of the future state, attach themselves to this worship. Osiris was identified with the sun. . . . Sun-worship was the primitive form of the Egyptian religion. perhaps even pre-Egyptian."

The bull, Apis, which was worshiped by the Egyptians was simply a form of Osiris. On this we have the following testimony from the "Encyclopedia Britannica:—

"According to the Greek writers Apis was the image of Osiris, and worshiped because Osiris was supposed to have passed into a bull, and to have been soon after manifested by a succession of these animals. The hieroglyphic inscriptions identify the Apis with Osiris, adorned with horns or the head of a bull, and unite the two names as Hapi-Osor, or Apis Osiris. According to this view the Apis was the incarnation of Osiris manifested in the shape of a bull."—*Art. Apis.*

Whenever a sacred bull was discovered, and there were certain well-defined marks by which he was known, he was conducted in state to the temple, and for forty days was attended by nude women. When the reader remembers that this animal was the representative of the sun, and of the sun as the great generative power in nature, he will readily see that Egyptian sun-worship must have been a religion of licentiousness.

The following from "Anthon's Classical Dictionary" (art. Hercules), gives in brief space as good an idea of the nature and extent of sun-worship as anything that can be found:—

"The mythology of Hercules is of a very mixed character in the form in which it has come down to us. There

is in it the identification of one or more Grecian heroes with Melcarth, the sun-god of the Phœnicians. Hence we find Hercules so frequently represented as the sun-god, and his twelve labors regarded as the passage of the sun through the twelve signs of the zodiac. He is the powerful planet which animates and imparts fecundity to the universe, whose divinity has been honored in every quarter by temples and altars, and consecrated in the religious strains of all nations. From Meroë, in Ethiopia, and Thebes in Upper Egypt, even to Britain, and the icy regions of Scythia; from the ancient Taprobana and Palibothra in India, to Cadiz and the shores of the Atlantic; from the forests of Germany to the burning sands of Africa; everywhere, in short, where the benefits of the luminary of day are experienced, there we find established the name and worship of a Hercules. Many ages before the period when Alcmena is said to have lived, and the pretended Tyrinthian hero to have performed his wonderful exploits, Egypt and Phœnicia, which certainly did not borrow their divinities from Greece, had raised temples to the sun, under a name analogous to that of Hercules, and had carried his worship to Thasus and to Gades. Here was consecrated a temple to the year, and to the months which divided it into twelve parts, that is, to the twelve labors or victories which conducted Hercules to immortality. It is under the name of Hercules *Astrochyton*, or the god clothed with a mantle of stars, that the poet Nonnus designates the sun, adored by the Tyrians. 'He is the same god,' observes the poet, 'whom different nations adore under a multitude of different names: Belus on the banks of the Euphrates, Ammon in Libya, Apis in Memphis, Saturn in Arabia, Jupiter in Assyria, Serapis in Egypt, Helios among the Babylonians, Apollo at Delphi, Æsculapius throughout Greece.'"

The same authority says also that "it is impossible to deny the identity of Bacchus with Osiris," and adds that "they both have for their symbols the head of a

bull." From all these things, therefore, we learn that sun-worship was the primitive form of idolatry, that no matter what names were given to the gods of any country, they were simply different representatives of the sun, or the host of heaven, and that all their worship was nothing but the deification of lust. The following, also from "Anthon's Classical Dictionary," bears directly on the last point:—

"At Erythræ, on the coast of Ionia, was to be seen a statue of Hercules, of an aspect completely Egyptian. The worship of the god was here celebrated by certain Thracian females, because the females of the country were said to have refused to make to the god an offering of their locks on his arrival at Erythræ. The females of Byblos sacrificed to Adonis their locks and their chastity at one and the same time, and it is probable that the worship of Hercules was not more exempt, in various parts of the ancient world, from the same dissolute offerings. In Lydia, particularly, it seems to have been marked by an almost delirious sensuality. Married and unmarried females prostituted themselves at the festival of the god. The two sexes changed their respective characters; and tradition reported that Hercules himself had given an example of this, when, assuming the vestments and occupation of a female, he subjected himself to the service of the voluptuous Omphale."

In the light of this, it is easy to see why the Lord said to the Israelites: "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for all that do so are an abomination unto the Lord thy God." Deut. 22:5.

One more citation must suffice for the testimony concerning the most ancient sun-worship. It is from the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," (art. Sun):—

"The worship of the sun as the most prominent and powerful agent in the kingdom of nature was widely diffused throughout the countries adjacent to Palestine. This worship was either direct, without the intervention of any statue or symbol, or indirect. Among the Egyptians the sun was worshiped under the title of Ra. . . . Among the Phœnicians the sun was worshiped under the title of Baal. At Tyre, Gaza, and Carthage, human sacrifices were offered to him. Among the Chaldeans the sun was worshiped under the title of Tammuz; and that the Arabians worshiped the sun we know from Theophrastus. Still more propagated was the worship of the sun among the Syrians (Aramæans). Famous temples were at Heliopolis, Emesa, Palmyra, Hierapolis. Sun-worship there was very old, and direct from the beginning; and even in later times, sun and moon were worshiped at Hierapolis without the intervention of any image. Among the pure Semites, or Aryans, direct worship to the sun was paid from the beginning, and still later. Thus among the Assyrians, and afterwards among the Persians, whose sun-worship is one and the same. . . . In later times the sun was worshiped among the Persians under the form of Mithras, which finally became the *Sol Deus Invictus* [the invincible sun-god] throughout the West, especially through the Romans."

This brings us down to the time of the Romans, but before we consider the worship of the sun in the Roman Empire, we must stop to note the fact that when God's ancient people apostatized, sun-worship, with its abominations, was always the form of idolatry into which they fell. This was very natural, because they were surrounded by it.

What has been given concerning the bull Apis as the representative of Osiris, the Egyptian sun-god, is sufficient to prove that when the Israelites made and worshiped the golden calf, while Moses was in the mount,

they were simply taking up the Egyptian sun-worship, and its lascivious orgies, with which they must have been so familiar.

In later times Jeroboam made two calves of gold, setting one up in Bethel, and the other in Dan, in order to keep the people from going to Jerusalem to worship God. Knowing, as we do, the nature of sun-worship, we can readily understand why he "made priests of the lowest of the people," and how it was that he "made Israel to sin." (See 1 Kings 12:26–31; 2 Kings 10:29.)

We have found out what Baal-worship was; and so when we read that in the time of Ahab Elijah was the only prophet of God, while Baal had four hundred and fifty prophets, and that the people had gone after Baal so generally that Elijah supposed himself to be the only man in the nation who was loyal to God, we know that sun-worship had at that time almost entirely supplanted the worship of Jehovah.

Still later we find that Manasseh "reared up altars for Baal, and made a grove [sun image]" and "worshiped all the host of heaven," and placed the sun images and altars in the house of the Lord. 2 Kings 21:1–7. We also find that a part of Josiah's good works was to clear the temple of the obscene images to the sun, and to take from it the horses "that the kings of Judah had given to the sun," and had stabled in the sacred building, thus turning the house of the Lord into a temple for heathen lewdness. (See 2 Kings 23:4–14.)

Many other scriptures might be cited, but these are sufficient to show the form of idolatry with which the true religion had to contend in the most ancient times. We may now take a brief glance at sun-worship among

the Romans, and how it affected the Christian church. If we multiply evidence on any point, it is simply that it may not be considered as one-sided.

Dr. T. W. Chambers, in the article previously referred to (*Old Testament Student*, January, 1886), says that at Baalbek, in the ancient Cœle-Syria, "the most imposing of the huge edifices erected upon a vast substruction, unequaled anywhere on earth in the size of its stones, some of them being sixty feet long and twelve feet in both diameters, is a great temple of the sun, two hundred and ninety feet by one hundred and sixty, which was built by Antoninus Pius." This emperor reigned from 138 to 160 A. D.

Sun-worship in Rome, however, reached its highest point under the reign of Elagabalus, A. D. 218–222. Of him and his times Milman says:—

"The pontiff of one of the wild forms of the nature worship of the East, appeared in the city of Rome as emperor. The ancient rites of Baal-Peor, but little changed in the course of ages, intruded themselves into the sanctuary of the Capitoline Jove, and offended at once the religious majesty and the graver decency of Roman manners. Elagabalus derived his name from the Syrian appellative of the sun; he had been educated in the precincts of the temple; and the emperor of Rome was lost and absorbed in the priest of an effeminate superstition. The new religion did not steal in under the modest demeanor of a stranger, claiming the common rights of hospitality as the national faith of a subject people: it entered with a public pomp, as though to supersede and eclipse the ancestral deities of Rome. The god Elagabalus was conveyed in solemn procession through the wondering provinces; his symbols were received with all the honor of the Supreme Deity."

"It was openly asserted, that the worship of the sun,

under his name of Elagabalus, was to supersede all other worship. If we may believe the biographies in the Augustan history, a more ambitious scheme of *a universal religion* had dawned upon the mind of the emperor. *The Jewish, the Samaritan, even the Christian, were to be fused and recast into one great system, of which the sun was to be the central object of adoration."—History of Christianity, book 2, chap. 8.* (See also Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chap. 6, paragraphs 20–25.)

The successors of Elagabalus had not, like him, been brought up in a temple of the sun, and consequently the worship of the sun received less attention after his death; but it always remained the prevailing idolatry in Rome. The Emperor Aurelian (A. D. 270–274), however, gave it a new impetus. Returning from his victory over Zenobia, the queen of the East, he made magnificent presents to the temple of the sun, which he had begun to build in the first year of his reign. Says Gibbon:—

"A considerable portion of his oriental spoils was consecrated to the gods of Rome; the capitol, and every other temple, glittered with the offerings of his ostentatious piety; and the temple of the sun alone received above fifteen thousand pounds of gold. This last was a magnificent structure, erected by the emperor on the side of the Quirinal hill, and dedicated, soon after the triumph, to that deity whom Aurelian adored as the parent of his life and fortunes. His mother had been an inferior priestess in the chapel of the sun; a peculiar devotion to the god of light was a sentiment which the fortunate peasant imbibed in his infancy; and every step of his elevation, every victory of his reign, fortified superstition by gratitude."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 11, paragraph 43.*

To Aurelian the bishops of Syria appealed in their contest with Paul of Samosata, an account of which is

given by Milman, "History of Christianity," book 2, chap. 8. In this appeal is seen the first open step toward putting Christianity under the patronage of a sun-worshiper. It was a step toward bringing about what Elagabalus desired,—a fusion of Christianity and paganism.

We pass to the time of Diocletian, who ascended the throne in 284 A. D., under whose reign Constantine was appointed Cæsar. The first act of his reign showed his devotion to the sun-god, and afforded evidence of the fact that the sun was recognized by the Roman people as the highest deity. It was thought that the Emperor Numerian had been murdered, and Diocletian felt that suspicion might attach to him, since he profited by the vacancy that was thus made. Accordingly he "ascended the tribunal, and, raising his eyes towards the sun, made a solemn profession of his own innocence, in the presence of that all-seeing deity."—*Gibbon, chap. 12, paragraph 41.*

In this connection Milman has a most suggestive passage. He says:—

"From Christianity, the new paganism had adopted the unity of the Deity, and scrupled not to degrade all the gods of the older world into subordinate demons or ministers. . . . But the Jupiter Optimus Maximus was not the great Supreme of the new system. The universal deity of the East, the sun, to the philosophic was the emblem or representative; to the vulgar, the Deity. Diocletian himself, though he paid so much deference to the older faith as to assume the title of Jovius, as belonging to the Lord of the world, yet, on his accession, when he would exculpate himself from all concern in the murder of his predecessor Numerian, appealed in the face of the army to the all-seeing deity of the sun. It is the oracle of Apollo of Miletus, consulted

by the hesitating emperor, which is to decide the fate of Christianity. The metaphorical language of Christianity had unconsciously lent strength to this new adversary; and, in adoring the visible orb, some, no doubt, supposed that they were not departing far from the worship of the 'Sun of Righteousness.'"—*History of Christianity, book 2, chap. 9.*

This passage is not simply suggestive; it is quite explicit, showing that before the beginning of the fourth century, Christianity had united with paganism on sun-worship. After this testimony from so learned a prelate as Dean Milman, we need not carry the subject much farther, although it is full of interest. But we must not omit Constantine from the list. We quote from Gibbon:

"Whatever symptoms of Christian piety might transpire in the discourses or actions of Constantine, he persevered till he was near forty years of age in the practice of the established religion; and the same conduct which in the court of Nicomedia might be imputed to his fear, could be ascribed only to the inclination or policy of the sovereign of Gaul. His liberality restored and enriched the temples of the gods; the medals which issued from his imperial mine are impressed with the figures and attributes of Jupiter and Apollo, of Mars and Hercules; and his filial piety increased the council of Olympus by the solemn apotheosis of his father Constantius. But the devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. The unerring shafts of that deity, the brightness of his eyes, his laurel wreath, immortal beauty, and elegant accomplishments, seem to point him out as the patron of a young hero. The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was

permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelar deity; and that, either waking or in a vision, he was blessed with the auspicious omens of a long and victorious reign. The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, paragraph 3.*

Dr. Talbot W. Chambers makes a brief statement which covers the same ground as the above, and adds the link which connects the Christianity of the Roman world with pagan sun-worship. He testifies as follows:—

"The Emperor Constantine, before his conversion, reverenced all the gods as mysterious powers, especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts; and when he became a monotheist the god whom he worshiped was, as Uhlhorn says, rather the 'Unconquered Sun' than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And indeed, when he enjoined the observance of the Lord's day, it was not under the name of *Sabbatum* or *Dies Domini*, but under its old astronomical and heathen title, *Dies Solis*, so that the law was as applicable to the worshipers of Apollo and Mithras as to the Christians."—*Old Testament Student, January, 1886.*

That in this Constantine was acting not as a disciple of Christ, but as a worshiper of the sun, will presently be made to appear. As proof that Sunday was the heathen festival day, we quote from "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary." That book says that Sunday is "so called because the day was anciently dedicated to the sun, or to its worship." The *North British Review* (vol. 18, p. 409), calls Sunday "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times." And Gibbon, in a note to paragraph 2, chapter 20, says that "Constantine styles the Lord's day *Dies Solis* [day of the sun], a name which could not offend the ears of his pagan subjects." Dr. Chambers, also, in the passage

quoted above, says that Constantine's Sunday law "was as applicable to the worshipers of Apollo and Mithras as to the Christians." And the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" has the following on the subject of "Sunday:"—

"Sunday (*Dies Solis*, of the Roman calendar; 'day of the sun,' because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The 'sun' of Latin adoration they interpreted as the 'Sun of Righteousness.' . . . No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined."

Of course there are no regulations for its observance laid down in the New Testament, for, as "Chambers's Encyclopedia" truly says:—

"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the Sabbatical observance of that day [Sunday] is known to have been ordained, is the edict of Constantine, A. D. 321."

The above citations most clearly connect the Sunday festival with pagan sun-worship. That it has no connection whatever with New Testament Christianity is evident from the utter silence of the New Testament concerning the day, with the exception of a few passing references to "the first day of the week" as a secular day, and from the fact that the Sabbath of creation and of the fourth commandment,—the seventh day of the week,—is the only Sabbath recognized by Christ or by any of the writers either of the Old Testament or the New. It only remains, therefore, for us to show that when Constantine issued his decree, and, indeed, ever after, he was a pagan,—a worshiper of the sun and of himself.

Eusebius, who was the friend and eulogist of Constantine, gives the following account of the church which he erected to the memory of the apostles:—

"All these edifices the emperor consecrated with the desire of perpetuating the memory of the apostles of our Saviour. He had, however, another object in erecting this building; an object at first unknown, but which afterwards became evident to all. He had, in fact, made choice of this spot in the prospect of his own death, anticipating with extraordinary fervor of faith, that his body would share their title with the apostles themselves, and that he should thus even after death become the subject, with them, of the devotions which should be performed to their honor in this place. He accordingly caused twelve coffins to be set up in this church, like sacred pillars in honor and memory of the apostolic number, in the center of which his own was placed, having six of theirs on either side of it. Thus, as I said, he had provided with prudent foresight an honorable resting-place for his body after death, and, having long before secretly formed this resolution, he now consecrated this church to the apostles, believing that this tribute to their memory would be of no small advantage to his own soul." —*Life of Constantine, book 4, chap. 60.*

This, be it remembered, was long after Constantine's Sunday edict, and after he is popularly supposed to have embraced Christianity. What "extraordinary fervor of faith" this "most Christian emperor" had—in himself—to be sure. This act places him where he belongs, among heathen rulers. Alexander, calling himself Hercules, and desiring to be worshiped as a god, was not more pagan than was Constantine, who expected that both pagans and Christians would pay him divine honors after his death. The man was utterly incapable of a thought for anything outside of himself and his own selfish interest. As proof that this is not a prejudiced conclusion, read the following from a first-day observer:—

"Of religious convictions Constantine had none. But

he possessed an intellect capable of penetrating the condition of the world. He perceived the conclusion of the great syllogism in the logic of events. He saw that Destiny was about to write *Finis* at the bottom of the last page of paganism. He had the ambition to avail himself of the forces of the new and old, which, playing on the minds and consciences of men, were about to transform the world. As yet the Christians were in the minority, but they had zeal and enthusiasm. The enthusiasm of paganism, on the contrary, had yielded to a cold and formal assent quite unlike the pristine fervor which had fired to human action in the time,

'When the world was new and the gods were young.'

So, for policy, the emperor began to favor the Christians. There was now an *ecclesia*, a church, compact, well-organized, having definite purposes, ready for universal persuasion, and almost ready for universal battle. Against this were opposed the warring philosophic sects of paganism. While biding his time, watching the turns of the imperial wheel, and awaiting the opportunity which should make him supreme, he was careful to lay hold of the sentiments and sympathies of budding Christendom, by favoring the sect in Gaul."

"In the same year of his triumph, the emperor issued from Milan his famous decree in favor of the Christian religion. The proclamation was in the nature of a license to those professing the new faith to worship as they would, under the imperial sanction and favor. Soon afterwards he announced to the world that the reason for his recognition of Christianity was a vision which he had seen while marching from Gaul against Galerius. Gazing into heaven, he had seen a tremendous and shining cross with this inscription: '*In Hoc Signo Vinces*,' 'Under this sign conquer.' The fiction served the purpose for which it was invented. As a matter of fact, the double-dealing moral nature of Constantine was incapable of any high devotion to a faith either old or new.

"His insincerity was at once developed in his course respecting the Roman Senate. That body was the stronghold of paganism. Any strong purpose to extinguish heathenism would have led Constantine into irreconcilable antagonism with whatever of senatorial power still remained. Instead of hostility, however, he began to restore the ancient body to as much influence in the State as was consistent with the unrestricted exercise of his own authority. In order further to placate the perturbed spirits of paganism, he himself assumed the office of Pontifex Maximus; and when the triumphal arch was reared commemorative of his victory, he was careful to place thereon the statues of the old gods, as well as the emblems of the new faith."—*History of the World, by John Clark Ridpath, LL.D., Prof. of History in De Pauw University, vol. 1, chap. 63, pp. 881–883.*

If this is true, and no one can deny it, then Constantine was never a Christian emperor. Even so strict a churchman as Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, is constrained to say of Constantine:—

"He permitted heathenism, and while he did so, how could he be received as a Christian? The Christian church never became responsible for his life and character, but strove to reform him and to prepare him for a true confession of Christ at some 'convenient season.' In this, there seems to have been a great fault somewhere, chargeable perhaps to Eusebius or to some other Christian counselor; but, when could anyone say—'The emperor is sincere and humble and penitent, and ought now to be received into the church.' It was a political conversion, and as such was accepted, and Constantine was a heathen till near his death. As to his final penitence and acceptance—'Forbear to judge.'"—*"Elucidation" 2 of Tertullian against Marcion, book 4.*

Then let us never again hear of Constantine as the first Christian emperor. But we wish to add one more

testimony concerning his heathenism. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says of him:—

"Paganism must still have been an operative belief with the man who, down almost to the close of his life, retained so many pagan superstitions. He was at best only half heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of the one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins, and ordaining the observance of Sunday under the name *Dies Solis* in his celebrated decree of March 321, though such a combination was far from uncommon in the first Christian centuries. Perhaps the most significant illustration of the ambiguity of his religious position is furnished by the fact that in the same year in which he issued the Sunday decree he gave orders that, if lightning struck the imperial palace or any other public building, 'the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use.'"

The original of this heathen Sunday edict is in the library of Harvard College, and reads as follows:—

"*Omnes Judices, urbanæque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturæ libere licenterque inserviant: quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas coelesti provisione concessa. Dat. Nonis Mart. Crispo. 2 & Constantio 2. Coss. 321. Corpus Juris Civilis Codicis lib. iii tit. 12. 3.*"

"Let all judges and town-people, and all artisans, rest on the venerable day of the sun. But let those who are situated in the country freely and at full liberty attend to the cultivation of their fields: because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn or planting vines; lest, by neglecting the proper occasion, they should lose the benefits granted by divine bounty."

—Given the seventh day of March, 321, Crispus and Constantine being consuls for the second time.

There can be no question but that the Christian church as a body had been drawing toward paganism and sun-worship before the days of Constantine, else that wily politician would not have issued his Sunday edict. Many pages back we gave the passage in which Mosheim says that the Christian bishops purposely multiplied rites for the purpose of rendering the pagans more friendly to them. This, together with the statement that a large part of the Christian observances and institutions, even in the second century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries, is evidence that the bishops would very readily adopt the most popular heathen festival day, in order to gain the favor of the pagans. We have also learned that Elagabalus designed to unite the Christian and pagan religions around one common deity, the sun. In the time of Diocletian the heathen sun-god and Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, were confounded by both pagans and Christians.

This blending of paganism and Christianity was, as we have already seen, furthered by the heathen philosophers who nominally accepted Christianity, and who are as a consequence honored as Fathers of the Christian church. We have quoted what Mosheim says of Ammonius Saccas, but the attention of the reader must right here be again directed to the statement that "being possessed of great fecundity of genius as well as eloquence, he undertook to bring all systems of philosophy and religion into harmony; or, in other words, to teach a philosophy, by which all philosophers, and the men of all religions, the Christian not excepted, might unite together and

have fellowship." Origen was the enthusiastic disciple of Ammonius; and the writings of Justin Martyr and Tertullian show that they likewise labored to show that there was after all no difference in principle between paganism and Christianity. Surely they well deserve the title of Fathers of the Catholic Church.

One quotation from Milman, and one from Eusebius, must close the case concerning the paganizing of Christianity. After speaking of the heathen ceremonies connected with the dedication of Constantine's city, Constantinople, Milman says:—

"The lingering attachment of Constantine to the favorite superstition of his earlier days may be traced on still better authority. The Grecian worship of Apollo had been exalted into the oriental veneration of the sun, as the visible representative of the Deity; and of all the statues which were introduced from different quarters, none were received with greater honor than those of Apollo. In one part of the city stood the Pythian, in the other the Sminthian deity. The Delphic Tripod, which, according to Zosimus, contained an image of the god, stood upon the column of the three twisted serpents, supposed to represent the mythic Python. But on a still loftier, the famous pillar of porphyry, stood an image in which *Constantine dared to mingle together the attributes of the sun, of Christ, and of himself.* According to one tradition, this pillar was based, as it were, on another superstition. The venerable Palladium itself, surreptitiously conveyed from Rome, was buried beneath it, and thus transferred the eternal destiny of the old to the new capital. The pillar, formed of marble and of porphyry, rose to the height of a hundred and twenty feet. The colossal image on the top was that of Apollo, either from Phrygia or from Athens. But the head of Constantine had been substituted for that of the god. The scepter proclaimed the dominion of the world; and it held in its

hand the globe, emblematic of universal empire. Around the head, instead of rays, were fixed the nails of the true cross. *Is this paganism approximating to Christianity, or Christianity degenerating into paganism?"—History of Christianity, book 3, chap. 3.*

Truly the learned prelate may be pardoned for asking that question. It is plain, however, that the answer must be that it was Christianity degenerating into paganism, for which the Fathers had so assiduously worked.

And now in the light of all this testimony, can anybody have a doubt as to what form of paganism degenerate Christianity took? When true religion degenerates, it always assumes the form of error with which it is surrounded. The history of the Jews shows that their apostasy always took the form of sun-worship. But the paganism of Rome was devotion to the sun. How then could apostate Christianity assume any other form than that of sun-worship? And that being the case, what else but Sunday, "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times," could be the grand connecting link between the two religions? The case would be clear, even without the positive testimony that has been adduced.

Having helped the bishops thus far in their attempts to paganize Christianity, Constantine exerted himself to root out the last vestige of the religion of Jehovah, by toning down the wild solar holiday so as to make it fully take the place of the true Sabbath. Says Eusebius:—

"He enjoined on all the subjects of the Roman Empire to observe the Lord's day as a day of rest, and also to honor the day which precedes the Sabbath; in memory, I suppose, of what the Saviour of mankind is recorded to have achieved on that day. And since his desire was to

teach his whole army zealously to honor the Saviour's day (which derives its name from light and from the sun), he freely granted to those among them who were partakers of the divine faith, leisure for attendance on the services of the church of God, in order that they might be able, without impediment, to perform their religious worship.

"With regard to those who were as yet ignorant of divine truth, he provided by a second statute that they should appear on each Lord's day on an open plain near the city, and there, at a given signal, offer to God with one accord a prayer which they had previously learned. He admonished them that their confidence should not rest in their spears, or armor, or bodily strength, but that they should acknowledge the supreme God as the giver of every good, and of victory itself; to whom they were bound to offer their prayers with due regularity, uplifting their hands toward heaven, and raising their mental vision higher still to the King of Heaven, on whom they should call as the author of victory, their preserver, guardian, and helper. The emperor himself prescribed the prayer to be used by all his troops, commanding them to pronounce the following words in the Latin tongue:—

"'We acknowledge thee the only God; we own thee as our king, and implore thy succor. By thy favor have we gotten the victory; through thee are we mightier than our enemies. We render thanks for thy past benefits, and trust thee for future blessings. Together we pray to thee, and beseech thee long to preserve to us, safe and triumphant, our emperor and his pious sons.'

"Such was the duty to be performed on Sunday by his troops, and such the prayer they were instructed to offer up to God."—*Life of Constantine, book 4, chap. 18–20.*

This testimony is exceedingly valuable as showing how Sunday was elevated from a heathen festival to the place of the "Christian Sabbath," and also the wholesale man-

ner in which the heathen were made "Christian." One god more or less made no difference to the heathen, who were accustomed to follow the lead of the emperor in matters of religion; and so Constantine found no opposition in his scheme of making the religion of Rome just Christian enough to please and bind to him his numerous and powerful Christian subjects, and just pagan enough to avoid displeasing his pagan subjects. As Bishop Coxe says, it was a shrewd political move to preserve the unity of his empire.

We have now shown: (1) That the fact that Sunday was observed to a certain extent by many professed Christians very early in the Christian era, is in itself no evidence that it was by divine sanction, since the same people practiced many pagan abominations; and (2) That the observance of Sunday was itself a pagan custom which was brought into the church by "converts" from heathenism; and was fostered, together with other pagan customs, in order that the heathen might be the more readily disposed to join the church. The worship which had formerly been rendered to Apollo, the sun-god, was transferred, together with the solar holiday, to the Sun of Righteousness, and in this way the Christians pleased the heathen by adopting their chief festival day, and at the same time they satisfied their own consciences by making the heathen holiday a "Christian" institution. Thus, when the papacy was fully established, it could be truly said to be only "paganism baptized," and even the "baptism" was a sham.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE GREAT APOSTASY (Concluded).

GROWTH OF PAPAL ASSUMPTION.

When the statement is made that the papacy effected the change in the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, the objection is raised that this change was brought about before there was any papacy. If this objection were valid, it would prove that the papacy never introduced any corrupt practices, since, as we have seen. every abomination of the papacy was in the church before the time of Constantine. But those who raise this objection, forget that the "mystery of iniquity" which culminated in the papacy, was working in the days of the apostle Paul, and that it only waited the taking away of paganism (which, as the ruling power, hindered its full development) to be revealed as "that wicked."

Perhaps it would help some people to see the point, if we should use the term Catholic Church, instead of papacy. The Catholic Church was a growth—the growth of error. It is true that that church has assumed the term "Catholic," which means "general," or "the whole," in order to indicate that it is the only and the original church. But it became Catholic only by lowering the standard of faith and morality so as to admit the heathen. The true church of God has never been "Catholic," for its principles are so pure that but few in any age have been willing to accept them. So the growth of error marks the rise of the Catholic Church. While the ma-

jority of the people on the earth do not belong to its communion, it may still with propriety retain its name, for its principles are the principles of the world, and there is no false system of religion that is not built upon the very same foundation that it is built on. That foundation is the opinions of man in opposition to the whole or a part of the plain, literal teaching of the Bible. In the self-styled Catholic Church this is not individual opinion, but the opinion of one man.

The way for the acceptance of a pope, in whose individuality the mass of mankind should sink their own, was prepared, as we have shown in previous chapters, by the excessive veneration that was shown for the writings of uninspired, and even unchristian, men. When men accept the assertions of the Fathers, there is nothing to hinder their acknowledging the pope of Rome, for he simply reflects the opinions of the Fathers. This is why he can contradict himself, and still be reckoned infallible. There are no two of the Fathers who fully agree with each other, and there is no one of them who fully agrees with himself. The Fathers are the real head of the Roman Catholic Church, and the pope is simply their mouth-piece; for it is more convenient for the people to have one man to declare to them the teaching of the Fathers, than for the people to find them out for themselves. To be sure, the contradictions of many infallible Fathers appear a little more incongruous when exhibited in the person of one infallible pope, but one soon gets used to that.

To show that even from the second and third centuries this essential element of the papacy was not lacking, a few testimonies will be introduced concerning episcopal and Romish arrogance. The following testi-

mony from Dr. Killen shows the power of the bishop even before Christianity was formally recognized by the empire:—

"As early as the middle of the second century, the bishop, at least in some places, was intrusted with the chief management of the funds of the church; and probably, about fifty years afterwards, a large share of its revenues was appropriated to his personal maintenance. His superior wealth soon added immensely to his influence. He was thus enabled to maintain a higher position in society than any of his brethren; and he was at length regarded as the great fountain of patronage and preferment. Long before Christianity enjoyed the sanction of the State, the chief pastors of the great cities began to attract attention by their ostentatious display of secular magnificence. . . . In the third century the chief pastor of the Western metropolis must have been known to the great officers of government, and perhaps to the emperor himself. Decius must have regarded the Roman bishop as a somewhat formidable personage, when he declared that he would sooner tolerate a rival candidate for the throne, and when he proclaimed his determination to annihilate the very office."—*Ancient Church, period 2, sec. 3, chap. 10, paragraph 3.*

This shows that it was not simply episcopal arrogance in general, but Romish arrogance in particular, that began to be manifested so early. Milman says (History of Latin Christianity, book 1, chap. 1), that "when the Emperor Aurelian transferred the ecclesiastical judgment over Paul of Samosata, a rebel against the empire as against the church, from the bishops of Syria to those of Rome and Italy," "Dionysius, as bishop of Rome, passed sentence in this important controversy." This was in the year 270 A. D.

Bingham bears testimony as follows, as to the manner in which the bishop lorded it over God's heritage:—

"That all the power of discipline was primarily lodged in the hands of the bishop, as all other offices of the church, is a matter uncontested, and evident from the whole foregoing history and account of the practice of the church. For the canons always speak of the bishop, at least in conjunction with his ecclesiastical senate, his presbytery, as cutting off offenders from the church, and imposing penance upon them; and then again examining their proficiency, and either lengthening their penance, or moderating it by his indulgence; and finally admitting them to the communion of the church by absolution."—*Antiquities, book 19, chap. 3.*

Again Milman says:—

"On the establishment of Christianity, as the religion if not of the empire, of the emperor, the bishop of Rome rises at once to the rank of a great accredited functionary; the bishops gradually, though still slowly, assume the life of individual character. The bishop is the first Christian in the first city of the world, and that city is legally Christian. The supreme pontificate of heathenism might still linger from ancient usage among the numerous titles of the emperor; but so long as Constantine was in Rome, the bishop of Rome, the head of the emperor's religion, became in public estimation the equal, [and] in authority and influence immeasurably the superior, to all of sacerdotal rank. The schisms and factions of Christianity now become affairs of State. As long as Rome is the imperial residence, an appeal to the emperor is an appeal to the bishop of Rome. The bishop of Rome sits, by the imperial authority, at the head of a synod of Italian prelates, to judge the disputes with the African Donatists."—*History of Latin Christianity, book 1, chap. 2.*

Of course if this was the case while the emperor was in Rome, it would be still more so when the bishop of Rome became the only ruler in that city. In the statement made above, that the bishops gradually assumed the

life of individual character, we have a parallel to the rise of the Sunday as the rival of the Sabbath. People sometimes say that if the Sabbath had been changed by the Catholic Church, we ought to be able to point out the very year in which such change was made. But changes from truth to error, from good to evil, are not made in that way. Just as no man plunges at once from virtue into vice, so no church changes from truth to error in a day. Error is a growth. The Sunday, like all the heathen customs adopted by the Catholic Church, came in gradually and silently, and was pretty well established before any laws were made in its behalf. The decrees of councils have not as a general thing been arbitrary laws telling what must be, so much as they have been the formulation of the opinions and practices largely prevalent at the time. They have simply marked the growth of error, instead of making error. Thus the papacy was well formed before the bishop of Rome was declared to be the supreme head. Infallibility had been attributed to the pope hundreds of years before it became a dogma of the church.

Speaking of the synod which Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, convened at Antioch, A. D. 342, the church historian Socrates says:—

"Neither was Julius bishop of ancient Rome there, nor did he indeed send a representative; although the ecclesiastical canon expressly commands that the churches shall not make any ordinances, without the sanction of the bishop of Rome."—*Ecclesiastical History, book 2, chap. 8.*

In a note to the above, the translator says:—

"No such canon as that referred to here by Socrates is known to be in existence as a written document; and

consequently our author must be understood to refer here to a principle, or unwritten law, existing, and universally acknowledged as existing, prior to all positive enactment on the subject."

In chapter 15 of the same book is found also the following:—

"After experiencing considerable difficulties, Athanasius at last reached Italy. The whole western division of the empire was then under the power of Constans, the youngest of Constantine's sons, his brother Constantine having been slain by the soldiery, as was before stated. At the same time also Paul bishop of Constantinople, Asclepas of Gaza, Marcellus of Ancyra a city of Galatia Minor, and Lucius of Adrianople, having been expelled from their several churches on various charges, arrived at the imperial city. There each laid his case before Julius bishop of Rome, who sent them back again into the East, restoring them to their respective sees by virtue of his letters, in the exercise of the Church of Rome's peculiar privilege; and at the same time in the liberty of that prerogative, sharply rebuking those by whom they had been deposed."

Eugene Lawrence gives the following brief and pointed account of the manner in which the "man of sin" began to exalt himself, as soon as Constantine removed the covering which concealed him:—

"In the last great persecution under Diocletian [A. D. 303–306], the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the bishop of Rome emerged from the catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of

persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the faith which he professed. The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud."—*Historical Studies, pp. 17, 18.*

But that all this arrogance existed in embryo before Constantine picked the shell, appears from Milman's statement that "the Christian hierarchy was completely organized and established in the minds of men before the great revolutions which, under Constantine, legalized Christianity, and, under Theodosius and his successors, identified the church and State."—*History of Christianity, book 4, chap. 1.* If it had not been so, the union of Church and State could not have been formed.

The following description of how bishops were elected, shows that the episcopal chair must have been regarded as a very exalted position, since it was so eagerly sought

after; and it shows, at the same time, how the corruption that was in the church found ample scope for its exercise as soon as the church became allied to the empire:—

"As soon as a bishop had closed his eyes, the metropolitan issued a commission to one of his suffragans to administer the vacant see, and prepare, within a limited time, the future election. The right of voting was vested in the inferior clergy, who were best qualified to judge of the merit of the candidates; in the senators or nobles of the city, all those who were distinguished by their rank or property; and finally in the whole body of the people, who, on the appointed day, flocked in multitudes from the most remote parts of the diocese, and sometimes silenced, by their tumultuous acclamations, the voice of reason and the laws of discipline. These acclamations might accidentally fix on the head of the most deserving competitor; of some ancient presbyter, some holy monk, or some layman, conspicuous for his zeal and piety. But the episcopal chair was solicited, especially in the great and opulent cities of the empire, as a temporal rather than as a spiritual dignity. The interested views, the selfish and angry passions, the arts of perfidy and dissimulation, the secret corruption, the open and even bloody violence which had formerly disgraced the freedom of election in the commonwealths of Greece and Rome, too often influenced the choice of the successors of the apostles. While one of the candidates boasted the honors of his family, a second allured his judges by the delicacies of a plentiful table, and a third, more guilty than his rivals, offered to share the plunder of the church among the accomplices of his sacrilegious hopes."—*Gibbon, chap. 20, paragraph 22.*

In the quotations previously given, we have seen how the "mystery of iniquity," even in the first centuries, had all the depraved characteristics of the "man of sin." In the few that follow we shall see how at the same time he

was preparing to stand forth as the one "that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." 2 Thess. 2:4, revised version. Says the historian:—

"The bishop was the perpetual censor of the morals of his people. The discipline of penance was digested into a system of canonical jurisprudence, which accurately defined the duty of private or public confession, the rules of evidence, the degrees of guilt, and the measure of punishment. It was impossible to execute this spiritual censure if the Christian pontiff, who punished the obscure sins of the multitude, respected the conspicuous vices and destructive crimes of the magistrate; but it was impossible to arraign the conduct of the magistrate, without controlling the administration of civil government. Some considerations of religion, or loyalty, or fear, protected the sacred persons of the emperors from the zeal or resentment of the bishops; but they boldly censured and excommunicated the subordinate tyrants, who were not invested with the majesty of the purple. St. Athanasius excommunicated one of the ministers of Egypt; and the interdict which he pronounced, of fire and water, was solemnly transmitted to the churches of Cappadocia. Under the reign of the younger Theodosius, the polite and eloquent Synesius, one of the descendants of Hercules, filled the episcopal seat of Ptolemais, near the ruins of ancient Cyrene, and the philosophic bishop supported with dignity the character which he had assumed with reluctance. He vanquished the monster of Libya, the president Andronicus, who abused the authority of a venal office, invented new modes of rapine and torture, and aggravated the guilt of oppression by that of sacrilege. After a fruitless attempt to reclaim the haughty magistrate by mild and religious admonition, Synesius proceeds to inflict the last sentence of ecclesiastical justice, which devotes Andronicus, with his as-

sociates and their families, to the abhorrence of earth and Heaven. The impenitent sinners, more cruel than Phalaris or Sennacherib, more destructive than war, pestilence, or a cloud of locusts, are deprived of the name and privileges of Christians, of the participation of the sacraments, and of the hope of Paradise. The bishop exhorts the clergy, the magistrates, and the people, to renounce all society with the enemies of Christ; to exclude them from their houses and tables; and to refuse them the common offices of life, and the decent rites of burial. The church of Ptolemais, obscure and contemptible as she may appear, addresses this declaration to all her sister churches of the world; and the profane who reject her decrees, will be involved in the guilt and punishment of Andronicus and his impious followers. These spiritual terrors were enforced by a dextrous application to the Byzantine court; the trembling president implored the mercy of the church; and the descendant of Hercules enjoyed the satisfaction of raising a prostrate tyrant from the ground. Such principles and such examples insensibly prepared the triumph of the Roman pontiffs, who have trampled on the necks of kings."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, paragraph 26.*

Let no one think that this statement of the case is colored in the least, to the prejudice of the church. We have quoted from Gibbon, because he summarizes the matter in the most concise form; if the reader will examine the "Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Cyclopedia," of McClintock and Strong, or the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," he will find all the above, and much more, given in detail.

The quotation last given shows the extent which ecclesiastical arrogance had reached in the early part of the fifth century; but a few more facts must be stated, in order more fully to emphasize the deplorable condition

of the church at that time, which could make such arrogance possible. This Synesius, of whom Gibbon speaks, was a native of Cyrene, born about A. D. 375; he studied philosophy and rhetoric at Alexandria, under Hypatia, the famous female heathen philosopher. He returned to his estate, where he devoted himself to the study of philosophy, to writing verses, and to the chase, acting the part of the elegant, wealthy gentleman of leisure. In 410 A. D., while still a pagan, he was elected bishop of Ptolemais, where he magnified his office in the way already recorded. Schaff says:—

"In 409 or 410 the people of Ptolemais elected him—the pagan philosopher, a married man—their bishop; and after some hesitation he accepted."

But he never gave up his heathenism. "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia," after speaking of the excellence of his style as a writer, says:—

"His philosophy is without originality. Yet even his philosophy merits attention, as illustrating the fine gradations by which pagan speculation melted into the semblance of Christianity without divesting itself of its pagan phrase and spirit."

Mosheim calls him a "semi-Christian."

This is a specimen of those who were elected to rule the church. When men who had never renounced pagan manner of thought and pagan practices, were not only admitted to communion in so-called Christian churches, but were actually placed at the head of the church, is it a misnomer to call the papacy which they formed, "paganism baptized"? Who having a knowledge of these facts, will be bold enough to quote the "custom of the early church" as a reason for Sunday observance, or for any other practice?

The case of Synesius was not an isolated one. Among ancient ecclesiastics, Ambrose, of Milan, stands at the head. Yet the circumstances of his elevation to the episcopacy are thus concisely and accurately summarized by the historian:—

"The palm of episcopal vigor and ability was justly claimed by the intrepid Ambrose. He was descended from a noble family of Romans; his father had exercised the important office of Prætorian prefect of Gaul; and the son, after passing through the studies of a liberal education, attained, in the regular gradation of civil honors, the station of consular of Liguria, a province which included the imperial residence of Milan. At the age of thirty-four, and before he had received the sacrament of baptism, Ambrose, to his own surprise, and to that of the world, was suddenly transformed from a governor to an archbishop. Without the least mixture, as it is said, of art or intrigue, the whole body of the people unanimously saluted him with the episcopal title; the concord and perseverance of their acclamations were ascribed to a preternatural impulse; and the reluctant magistrate was compelled to undertake a spiritual office, for which he was not prepared by the habits and occupations of his former life. But the active force of his genius soon qualified him to exercise, and with zeal and prudence, the duties of his ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and while he cheerfully renounced the vain and splendid trappings of temporal greatness, he condescended, for the good of the church, to direct the conscience of the emperors, and to control the administration of the empire."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 27, paragraph 12.*

These things will not occasion surprise to those who have read the chapters in this book, upon the Fathers. If the writings of "semi-Christian" (which means semi-pagan) men could be accepted by the church as inspired, it was a natural consequence for the same kind of men

to be placed in positions of chief authority. It should not be forgotten that a "semi-Christian" was one who *professed Christianity and practiced paganism*, or who melted pagan speculation "into the semblance of Christianity."

Speaking of Gregory, bishop of Constantinople, and the way in which his successor was appointed, Gibbon says:—

"His resignation was accepted by the synod, and by the emperor, with more readiness than he seems to have expected. At the time when he might have hoped to enjoy the fruits of his victory, his episcopal throne was filled by the senator Nectarius; and the new archbishop, accidentally recommended by his easy temper and venerable aspect, was obliged to delay the ceremony of his consecration, till he had previously dispatched the rites of his baptism."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 27, paragraph 9.*

These are the men to whom we are directed to look for guidance in matters of Christian faith and practice. We prefer to look to a higher source. What could be expected of a church which depended for its instruction upon men who, up to the time of their consecration as bishops, and, in fact, all their lives, were heathen philosophers and politicians? "Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?" Luke 6: 39.

Of course persecution was the natural result of so great power lodged in the hands of such men. Human nature cannot brook restraint or opposition, and when unconverted men stood at the head of the church, they would naturally, in combating heresy, employ the methods of secular tyrants. And "heresy," be it understood, was whatever differed from the ideas of these pagan-Christian bishops. We should be remiss in our duty if we did not

point out the fact that the union of Church and State was responsible for this condition of things. As corroborating the conclusion first stated in this paragraph, we quote the following:—

"It was supposed, that the error of the heretics could proceed only from the obstinate temper of their minds; and that such a temper was a fit object of censure and punishment. The anathemas of the church were fortified by a sort of civil excommunication; which separated them from their fellow-citizens, by a peculiar brand of infamy; and this declaration of the supreme magistrate tended to justify, or at least to excuse, the insults of a fanatic populace. The sectaries were gradually disqualified for the possession of honorable or lucrative employments; and Theodosius was satisfied with his own justice, when he decreed, that, as the Eunomians distinguished the nature of the Son from that of the Father, they should be incapable of making their wills, or of receiving any advantage from testamentary donations. The guilt of the Manichæan heresy was esteemed of such magnitude, that it could be expiated only by the death of the offender; and the same capital punishment was inflicted on the Audians, or Quartodecimans, who should dare to perpetrate the atrocious crime of celebrating on an improper day the festival of Easter. Every Roman might exercise the right of public accusation; but the office of Inquisitors of the Faith, a name so deservedly abhorred, was first instituted under the reign of Theodosius."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 27, paragraph 10.*

And in behalf of the conclusion in regard to Church and State the following is quoted:—

"The grateful applause of the clergy has consecrated the memory of a prince who indulged their passions and promoted their interest. Constantine gave them security, wealth, honors, and revenge; and the support of the orthodox faith was considered as the most sacred and im-

portant duty of the civil magistrate. The edict of Milan, the great charter of toleration, had confirmed to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion. But this inestimable privilege was soon violated; with the knowledge of truth, the emperor imbibed the maxims of persecution; and the sects which dissented from the Catholic Church were afflicted and oppressed by the triumph of Christianity. Constantine easily believed that the heretics, who presumed to dispute *his* opinions, or to oppose *his* commands, were guilty of the most absurd and criminal obstinacy; and that a seasonable application of moderate severities might save those unhappy men from the danger of an everlasting condemnation. Not a moment was lost in excluding the ministers and teachers of the separated congregations from any share of the rewards and immunities which the emperor had so liberally bestowed on the orthodox clergy. But as the sectaries might still exist under the cloud of royal disgrace, the conquest of the East was immediately followed by an edict which announced their total destruction. After a preamble filled with passion and reproach, Constantine absolutely prohibits the assemblies of the heretics, and confiscates their public property to the use either of the revenue or of the Catholic Church. . . . The design of extirpating the name, or at least of restraining the progress, of these odious heretics, was prosecuted with vigor and effect. Some of the penal regulations were copied from the edicts of Diocletian; and this method of conversion was applauded by the same bishops who had felt the hand of oppression, and pleaded for the rights of humanity."—*Id., chap. 21, paragraph 1.*

To show that this is a simple historical fact, and not the harsh judgment of one who was biased in his opinions, we quote a decree of Constantine, concerning the doctrines of Arius and those who held to them. It is taken from the "Ecclesiastical History" of Socrates, book 1, chap. 9, and reads as follows:—

"Victor Constantine Maximus Augustus, to the bishops and people.—Since Arius has imitated wicked and impious persons, it is just that he should undergo the like ignominy. Wherefore as Porphyry, that enemy of piety, for having composed licentious treatises against religion, found a suitable recompense, and such as thenceforth branded him with infamy, overwhelming him with deserved reproach, his impious writings also having been destroyed; so now it seems fit both that Arius and such as hold his sentiments should be denominated Porphyrians, that they may take their appellation from those whose conduct they have imitated. And in addition to this, if any treatise composed by Arius should be discovered, let it be consigned to the flames, in order that not only his depraved doctrine may be suppressed, but also that no memorial of him may be by any means left. This therefore I decree, that if anyone shall be detected in concealing a book compiled by Arius, and shall not instantly bring it forward and burn it, the penalty for this offense shall be death; for immediately after conviction the criminal shall suffer capital punishment. May God preserve you!"

We have now shown the condition of the church in the period in which Sunday observance originated among Christians. We would by no means have the reader get the idea that what has been described in the quotations made, was Christianity in any sense of the term. It was essentially paganism under the mask of Christianity,—a mask which cannot in the least conceal the monster beneath, from the eyes of one who is not blinded by unreasoning prejudice. True Christianity existed at the same time, but it did not rear its head so loftily. True to its nature, it occupied a lowly position. Its adherents instead of being "the people" of the Roman Empire, were only a very small minority of the subjects of that great

power; "for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:13, 14. True Christianity did not invoke the aid of temporal power, but made its conquests by the aid alone of the Spirit, and by its sword, which is the word of God. Therefore those who wish to walk in the strait and narrow way marked out by the great Founder of Christianity, will not go for guidance to the customs of that vast assemblage of heathen Christians which is called the "church," but to the word of God, "which liveth and abideth forever."

APPENDIX.

THE TRUE AND ABIDING SABBATH.

In the body of the book the reader has been shown the foundation upon which the Sunday-sabbath rests; his attention is now called to a very brief examination of the foundation upon which the true Sabbath rests, that he may contrast the baseless fabric of heathenism with that which cannot be shaken.

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is; and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8–11.

The fourth commandment is the solid foundation upon which Sabbath-keeping rests. They who tremble at the word of God, can desire no other. If we analyze it, we shall find that it consists of a simple command to keep the Sabbath day holy, and then such an explicit definition of the Sabbath as distinguishes it from every other day, so that no attentive person can fail to know what day the Sabbath is.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath." What seventh day? The most natural conclusion is that it is the seventh day of the week; for the fact that six days of labor precede it, shows that it is the last in a period of seven days; and the only period of seven days is the week. Besides, the com-

mandment specifies what is meant by saying, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is; and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." The "creation week" is a very common term to express the time of God's creation and rest. The day on which God rested was the seventh day of the creation week; the day on which we are commanded to rest is the seventh day of the week, which took its rise from the first week of time. in which God created the heavens and the earth, and rested.

That the seventh day *of the week* is the Sabbath, and that this is what the commandment enjoins, is evident from a passage in the New Testament. The writers of the four Gospels all record with more or less minuteness the events of the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. They all state that the crucifixion was on the preparation day, that is, the day before the Sabbath. They likewise all mention the fact that certain women came to the sepulcher very early on the first day of the week, and found it empty. Luke says (24:1) that they came "upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning;" and Mark says (16:1) that it was "when the Sabbath was past." Now read in consecutive order what Luke says immediately following his account of the burial of Jesus:—

"And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.* Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared." Luke 23: 54–56; 24:1.

From this text we learn that the preparation day immediately preceded the Sabbath day. Verse 54. We learn

also that the first day of the week immediately followed the Sabbath. Then since there are but seven days in the week, that Sabbath day must have been the seventh day of the week. "Well," says one, "nobody questions that; what is the use of stating it so explicitly?" Simply because that Sabbath day which is proved beyond all possibility of denial to have been *the seventh day of the week*, was kept by the women, "*according to the commandment.*" Thus we have it most positively proved by an inspired writer that the Sabbath day which the fourth commandment says we must remember to keep holy, is *the seventh day of the week.*

"Remember the Sabbath day to *keep* it holy," not to *make* it holy. Man cannot make anything holy; God alone has that power. It is an unwarrantable, almost a blasphemous, assumption, to say that men can sanctify as the Sabbath any day on which they may choose to rest. The Lord made the Sabbath day holy, and he requires man to keep it holy, and not to pollute it by unholy words and deeds.

But the Sabbath did not originate with the giving of the commandment from Sinai. At that time God only declared the law which already existed. The sacredness of the Sabbath, which is guarded by the fourth commandment, did not begin at that time, any more than the sacredness of human life, which is guarded by the sixth commandment, began at that time. The commandment itself refers us to creation. Why are we commanded to keep the Sabbath day holy? "For [because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is; and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

The statement that God blessed and hallowed the Sabbath day, is equivalent to saying that he blessed and hallowed the seventh day, for "the *seventh* day *is* the Sabbath." It became the Sabbath from the time when God

rested upon it. The Sabbath is the name of the seventh day of the week, which God sanctified. That God did bless and sanctify, or make holy, the seventh day in particular, and not merely the Sabbath institution in general, is plainly declared in the record to which the commandment refers.

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And *God blessed the seventh day and sanctified* it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

This statement that God sanctified the seventh day, because that in it he *had* rested, upsets the theory that God's Sabbath is an immensely long time; that the Sabbath which he begun when he finished the work of creation, is not yet completed. Such a theory makes nonsense of the fourth commandment, which enjoins upon us the day on which God rested; but if it were true that God's Sabbath has continued since creation, and is even now going on, a command for us to keep the Sabbath of the Lord would be the same as a command for us never to do any work! But the fact is clearly stated, that when God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, his rest upon it was in the past. He blessed and sanctified it, not because he was resting in it, but because he *had rested in* it.

Notice now the steps by which the Sabbath was made: First, God made the heavens and the earth in six days,—six days such as we are familiar with, composed of a dark part and a light part, caused by the revolution of the earth upon its axis, and each completed in twenty-four hours. Second, God rested on the seventh day. Third, he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested. Then it became God's holy Sabbath day.

At the close of God's rest upon the seventh day, he sanctified it. To sanctify means to appoint, to set apart by specific directions and injunctions. Thus the Lord says: "Sanctify ye a fast, call a solemn assembly." Joel 1:14. The children of Israel appointed (margin, sanctified) six cities as places of refuge. (See Joshua 20:7.) They sanctified them by setting them apart for that purpose, and letting everybody know it. Still more clear is the evidence in the nineteenth of Exodus. When the Lord would come down upon Mount Sinai, he said to Moses: "And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it." Ex. 19:12. And afterwards Moses said unto the Lord: "The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it." Verse 23. So God sanctified the Sabbath, by placing around it the sanctions of his word, and commanding the people then living—Adam and Eve—and through them their descendants, not to step over those bounds.

On these three facts the Sabbath rests: God created the heavens and the earth in six days; he rested on the seventh day; he blessed and sanctified, or appointed as sacred, the seventh day. Before the Sabbath can be changed, the facts of creation must be changed. But a *fact* is that which has been done, and a fact cannot be changed. Even if the heavens and the earth were destroyed, it would still remain a fact that God created them, and that he rested upon and blessed and hallowed the seventh day, as a memorial of his creation; and upon these facts the Sabbath rests. To abolish the Sabbath, or to change it to another day than the seventh, it would be necessary to annihilate the heavens and the earth, and not only so, but to annihilate the fact that they were ever created, so as to make it a truth that they never had an existence. But this even omnipotence cannot do.

What stability there is to the works of God! "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. 111:7, 8. Therefore "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

———:—:———

THE APOSTLES AND THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

IN the chapter on "Sun-worship and Sunday" it is shown that Sunday was from the most ancient times a heathen festival day, devoted to the licentious sun-worship, and that the adoption of it by the early church was a link which joined the church to paganism. Its existence in the church to-day, although it has been clothed with something of the semblance of the Sabbath, whose place it has usurped, is a standing reminder of the great apostasy, and a proof that the Reformation did not entirely clear the church from pagan corruption. This being the case, it is evident that there can be no authority for it in the Bible, and this has been expressly stated. It may, however, be well to note those passages which mention the first day of the week, since if there were any sacredness attached to the day, it would there be at least intimated. The argument must, as a matter of course, be negative.

Our task is not very great, for the first day of the week is mentioned only eight times in the New Testament, and six of these instances of its occurrence have reference to a single first day,—the day on which Christ rose from the tomb. These six texts are Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19. They read, in order, as follows:—

"In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." Matt. 28:1.

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene,

and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun." Mark 16:1, 2.

"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." Mark 16:9.

"Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared." Luke 24:1.

"The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher." John 20:1.

"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you." John 20:19.

In none of these texts is there the least hint that the day was sacred, or was henceforth to be considered so. They simply state that Jesus met with certain of his disciples on the day of his resurrection. Those incidents are mentioned to show that Christ did really rise from the dead the third day, as he had said. That he should show himself at once to his disciples, was the most natural thing in the world, in order to relieve their sorrow. The meeting referred to in John 20:19 was not a religious meeting, not a gathering for prayer, or to celebrate the resurrection, but simply such a meeting as Jesus had with Mary in the garden, with the other women, and with Peter, being one of the "many infallible proofs" of his resurrection. That this is so, is evident from the fact that the eleven had one common abode (Acts 1:13), and that just before Jesus came into the room where they were, the two disciples to whom Jesus appeared "as they walked, and went into the

country" had returned and told the eleven that Jesus was risen, but their story was not believed Mark 16:12, 13. Moreover, when Jesus himself appeared unto them, they were sitting at meat, and he "upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark 16:14. They could not have celebrated his resurrection, when they did not believe that he had risen. A comparison of Acts 1:13 with Mark 16:14, and Luke 24:36–43, is sufficient to show that when Jesus met with his disciples on the evening of the day after his resurrection, they were simply eating their supper at home, and did not believe that he had risen.

When Jesus met with them he did not tell them that thenceforth they must observe the first day of the week in honor of his resurrection, nor did he pronounce any blessing on that day. In short, he made no reference whatever to the day. To the disciples he gave the salutation of peace, saying, "Peace be unto you," and he breathed on them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" but that affected the disciples, and not the day. Thus we see that in connection with the resurrection of Jesus there is not the remotest hint of Sunday sacredness.

The next reference to the first day of the week is in Acts 20:7, and there we find that a meeting was held on that day. And here one thing may be noted, namely, that this is the only direct mention in the New Testament of a religious meeting on the first day of the week. If there were the record of fifty meetings on that day, however, that would not in the least affect its standing, for meetings were held every day in the week. The New Testament contains an account of many meetings held on the Sabbath, but that is no reason why the Sabbath should be kept. The Sabbath stands on a different foundation than that, even on the unchanging word of God.

But what of this one meeting on the first day of the

week. We note first that it was in the night, for "there were many lights in the upper chamber, where they were gathered together" (verse 8); and Paul preached until midnight (verse 7), and then, after a brief intermission, until break of day, when he departed. Verse 11. But every day, according to the Bible method of reckoning time, ends at the setting of the sun. (See Gen. 1: 5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; Lev. 23: 32; Mark 1: 32.) Therefore, since this meeting at Troas was in the dark part of the first day of the week, it could not have been at the close of that day, but must have been at the beginning, corresponding to what is popularly designated as "Saturday night."

Now note what immediately followed that Saturday night meeting. As soon as it was break of day, on Sunday morning, Paul's companions went to the ship, and resumed their journey to Jerusalem, while Paul himself chose to walk across the country and join the ship's company at Assos. The distance from Troas to Assos was about sixty miles by water, but only about nineteen by land, so that Paul could easily reach that place before the ship did. That this trip was taken on the first day of the week is so evident that few, if any, commentators suggest any different view. The Scriptures need no indorsement from men; but it may help some minds to know that this view of the text is not a peculiar one. "Conybeare and Howson's Life of Paul" says of this trip of Paul's:—

"Strength and peace were surely sought and obtained by the apostle, from the Redeemer, as he pursued his lonely road that Sunday afternoon in spring among the oak woods and the streams of Ida."—*Chapter 20, paragraph 11.*

So far, then, as the example of the apostles goes, Sunday is to be used in secular employment.

One more text completes the list of references to the first day. It is 1 Cor. 16: 2, and, together with the preceding verse, reads as follows:—

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

A literal rendering of this would be, "Let each one of you lay by himself at home, treasuring up in store, as God hath prospered him," and that Paul's injunction has reference to private stores and not to public collections is evident from the language, as well as from what the apostle wrote in his second epistle, in which he says: "I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and *make up beforehand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before,* that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not as of covetousness." 2 Cor. 9:5. But if their offerings had been cast into the collection box, and so kept all together in the treasury of the church, there would have been no need of sending the brethren ahead to *make up beforehand* their bounty.

These are all the texts that speak of the first day of the week, and not one of them intimates that it was in any sense a sacred day. Indeed, at the time the New Testament was written, no one in the world had ever heard of "the day of the sun" being kept as a sacred day, for the heathen observed it only as a wild festival day.

But throughout the New Testament the seventh day of the week is called the Sabbath—the same title that is given to it in the commandment. This is not because the New Testament writers were Jews, for they did not write as Jews, but as men inspired by the Holy Spirit. They were Christians, writing, under guidance of the Spirit of God, for the comfort, encouragement, and instruction of Christians until the end of time. If the seventh day were not the Sabbath for Christians and for all men, then the Holy Spirit would not have given it that name. But the truth is, as shown before, that the seventh day *is* the

Sabbath—made so by the unchangeable act of the Creator —and no other day can ever be the Sabbath. And so we see that Dr. Scott and the *Christian at Work* told the exact truth when they said that we must go to later than apostolic times to find Sunday observance, and that it came in gradually and silently. But for everything that came into the church after the days of Christ, the church is indebted to paganism.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES.

Johann August Wilhelm Neander was born in Göttingen, Germany, January 15, 1789, and died July 14, 1850. He was by birth a Jew, but in 1806 he renounced Judaism. His name was originally Mendel, but upon his baptism he adopted the name Neander, from two Greek words signifying "new man." He was at various times professor in the Universities of Heidelberg and Berlin. He was the author of numerous works, the greatest of which was his "Church History." He is universally conceded to be by far the greatest of ecclesiastical historians, and is commonly called "the father of modern church history."

Archibald Bower was born at Dundee, Scotland, January 17, 1686, and died in London, September 3, 1766. In early life he was a Catholic, and became a Jesuit. In 1726 he became a member of the Established Church of England, and was made librarian to the queen in 1747. His "History of the Popes" (London, 1750) contains the most copious account of the popes that has ever appeared in the English language.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, called the "father of church history," was born A. D. 270. He was the first to collect the scattered annals of the first three centuries of the Christian church, in his "Ecclesiastical History," which covers the ground from the birth of Christ to the defeat of Licinius, A. D. 324. He was very prominent in the Trinitarian controversy, though just which side he espoused in the Council of Nice it is difficult to decide, as his policy through life was to be on the winning side. This led him to be the eulogist of Constantine, whose intimate friend he became, and whose life he wrote, completing it just before his death, which occurred A. D. 340.

John Karl Ludwig Gieseler was born at Petershagen near Minden, Prussia, March 3, 1793; he died at Göttingen, July 8, 1854. He was appointed director of the gymnasium of Cleve, in 1818, and professor of theology in Bonn University, in 1819. In 1831 he accepted a call to the University of Göttingen, where he spent the remainder of his life. His reputation rests chiefly on his "Church History." The "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia" says that this work is in its kind "one of the most remarkable productions of German learning, distinguished by its immense erudition, accuracy, and careful selection of passages." And "McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia" declares it to be "beyond question, the most learned, faithful, and impartial *compendium* of church history that has ever appeared."

Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., was born at Coire, Switzerland, January 1, 1819. He studied at Coire, in the gymnasium at Stuttgart, and in the universities of Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin. After traveling through Europe as tutor to a Prussian nobleman, he became lecturer on exegesis and church history in the University of Berlin. From 1843 until 1863 he was a professor in the German Reformed Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. Afterwards he lectured on church history in the theological seminaries at Andover, Hartford, and New York, and since 1869 has been a professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. He is one of the founders of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance, and has been prominent in the councils of that body, both in this and foreign countries. He was president of the American Bible Revision Committee, and attended several meetings of the British Committee, in the Jerusalem Chamber, London. He is the author of very many works, both in German and English, and some of his works have been translated into French, Dutch, Greek, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Syriac, and Arabic.

Frederic William Farrar, D. D., was born in Bombay, India, August 7, 1831. He was educated at King William's College, Isle of Man, King's College, London, University of London, and Trinity College, Cambridge. He was ordained deacon of the Church of England in 1854, and priest in 1857; in 1876 he became canon, and in 1883 archdeacon, of Westminster. He is quite prominent as an educator and a temperance worker, and is the author of very many works.

Thomas De Quincey was born in Manchester, England, August 15, 1785, and died December 8, 1859. He was noted for his conversational powers, and his rare and varied stock of information. He became so proficient in Greek at an early age that his teacher said he could harangue an Athenian mob. His published works are numerous, and stored with information, which is conveyed in a most interesting manner.

William D. Killen, D. D. (Presbyterian), was born at Ballymena, County Antrim, Ireland, April 5, 1806. He was educated at the Royal Academical Institution in Belfast, and in 1829 became minister of Raphoe, County Donegal, Ireland. In 1841 he was called to Belfast, became Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and in 1869 he became president of the faculty.

John Lawrence von Mosheim, or Johann Lorenz, was an eminent German theologian, pulpit orator, and historian. He was born at Lubeck, in 1694, and died in 1755. He was educated at Kiel, and at the age of thirty-one became professor of theology at Helmstedt, where he obtained a wide celebrity as a teacher. In 1747 he was called to the chair of theology in the university at Göttingen, with the title of chancellor. Though not a prolific writer, he was an able one, and his great work, "Institutes of Ecclesiastical History," originally written

in Latin, has been translated into German, French, and English. Besides the work already mentioned, Mosheim wrote "Commentaries on Christianity before the Time of Constantine the Great" (referred to in this work as "Ecclesiastical Commentaries"), and "Morality of the Holy Scriptures," a work in nine volumes, besides other works of minor importance. He also translated Cudworth's "Intellectual System" into Latin.

Alexander Carson, LL.D., a man eminent for his learning and for his ability as a writer, was born in Ireland in 1776, and died in his native land in 1844. He was educated in Scotland at the Glasgow University, and was for a time a Presbyterian minister, but his allegiance to the plain reading of the Bible caused him to become a Baptist. He was a prolific writer, and the author of numerous religious and theological works, prominent among which is his able and exhaustive work entitled, "Baptism, Its Mode and Subjects."

Joseph Bingham was one of the most learned divines that the Church of England ever produced. He was born in Wakefield, England, in 1668, and received his education at Oxford. He afterwards became a fellow of the University College, but being called upon to preach before the University, he expressed some opinions upon the Trinity, which, being regarded as heretical, raised a great storm, which induced him to leave the University. His opinions did not, however, place him under the ban of the church, and he afterwards received the rectory of Havant, in Hampshire, where he continued until his death, in 1723. The great work of his life was his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," comprising eight volumes, the last of which appeared in 1722. Of this work, McClintock and Strong's "Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Cyclopedia" says: "This great work is a perfect repertory of facts in ecclesiastical archæology, and has not been superseded or even approached in its own line by any book

since produced." It has been translated and printed in German by the Catholics.

Henry Hart Milman, D.D., a distinguished ecclesiastic of the English Church, was born in London in 1791, and died in the same city in 1868. He was educated at Eton and at Oxford, where he took the degrees of B. A. and M. A. Mr. Milman was the author of quite a number of works, but it is to his historical works that his fame as a scholar is mostly due. His "History of the Jews" was first published in 1829, and still later, his "History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire." The work, however, which has made for him the greatest reputation, is his "History of Latin Christianity, Including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V." This work consists of eight volumes, and was published in both London and New York in 1854. Though complete in itself, it is really a continuation of the author's "History of Christianity." Among Milman's other works are "Life of Keats" and "Hebrew Prophecy." In 1849 Mr. Milman was appointed dean of St. Paul's, a position which he held till his death. He had previously been rector of St. Margaret's, and rector and canon of Westminster.

Socrates Scholasticus, the ecclesiastical historian, was born in Constantinople, near the close of the fifth century. He was educated in Alexandria, where for a time he practiced law and taught philosophy. Finally, however, he seems to have devoted himself entirely to the study of ecclesiastical history, and in the latter part of his life undertook to write a history of the church from A. D. 309, where Eusebius's history ends, down to his own time; the work, which comprises seven books, was completed, however, down only to A. D. 440. It is said of Socrates that "he is generally considered the most exact and judicious of the three continuators of the history of Eusebius, being less florid in his style and more careful in his state-

ments than Sozomen, and less credulous than Theodoret." Like all the early church historians, he was a Catholic, yet "his impartiality is so strikingly displayed," says Waddington, "as to make his orthodoxy questionable to Baronius, the celebrated Roman Catholic historian; but Valesius, in his life, has shown that there is no reason for such suspicion;" and he is now held in high esteem by Romanists generally.

Adolph Harnack, D. D., Ph. D., was born at Dorpat, Russia, May 7, 1854. He studied in the famous university of his native town from 1869–1872; became tutor at Leipsic in 1874, and professor in 1876. In 1879 he became professor of church history at Giessen, and in 1886 at Marburg. His reputation as a scholar and author is very high in the theological world.

APPENDIX B.

BAPTISM IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

THE references that have been made to baptism, in the body of this book, show that there was less perversion of that ordinance, in the early centuries, than of any other. Of course, in the general religious declension of the age, the real spirit of this ordinance, as of every other, was largely lost. When faith gave way to form, as it did when the pagans, with whom religion was nothing but form, came into the church in droves, the church in general lost sight of the fact that it is faith that saves, and attached saving virtue to the water of baptism. Of this we have evidence in the writings of Tertullian. Various additions to the rite were made, but the act of baptism itself remained unchanged. Some testimony to this effect has been given; but since the foregoing pages were put in type, a book has been issued, which gives so plain a statement of the case that we insert it here for the benefit of our readers. The book is entitled "Christian Archæology," by Chas. W. Bennett, D. D., Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois, with an introductory commendation by Dr Ferdinand Piper, of the University of Berlin. It is the fourth volume of the "Biblical and Theological Library," edited by George R. Crooks, D. D., and Bishop John F. Hurst, D. D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is very highly recommended by the religious press. Both the author and the editors are fully committed to the custom of sprinkling, and of administering the rite to infants, and therefore their testimony is of the more value, since it is directly opposed to their practice, and to their argument in the book itself. On page 392 of "Christian Archæology" we find the following:—

"While no positive statement relative to infant baptism is met in the Scriptures, or in the writings of any Fathers earlier than Irenæus and Tertullian, by the end of the second century men-

tion is made of the baptism of children, and in the third, of infants. But even in the fourth, the practice of infant baptism is not general, since eminent Fathers, whose parents were Christians, did not receive baptism till adult age. . . . From the fourth century the propriety of the baptism of infants was unquestioned, and the practice was not unusual; nevertheless, adult baptism was the more common practice for the first six centuries."

On page 396, under the heading of "The Mode of Baptism," we find the following statement:—

"There is not the slightest evidence that, during the apostolic period, the mere mode of administration underwent any change. The customary mode was used by the apostles in the baptism of the first converts. They were familiar with the baptism of John's disciples, and of the Jewish proselytes. This was ordinarily by dipping or immersion. This is indicated not only by the words used in describing the rite, but the earliest testimony of the documents which have been preserved gives preference to this mode."

Finally, on page 407, we find the following:—

"We are compelled to believe that while immersion was the usual mode of administering baptism from the first to the twelfth century, there was very early a large measure of Christian liberty allowed in the church, by which the mode of baptism could be readily adjusted to the peculiar circumstances."

Our readers will know how much value to place on the "Christian liberty" that existed in the early centuries of the church, and which consisted in the unchristian practice of perverting the plainest precepts of the Bible, to suit the notions of the interpreter. This is not liberty at all, but license, and most unwarranted license. Christian liberty lies in only one direction, and that is, liberty to do right; and right is nothing else than what the Bible enjoins. When men take the liberty to depart from the rules laid down in the Bible, they cease to be Christian, and their acts are not to be followed. Therefore that which in the preceding paragraph is called "Christian liberty" was nothing but pagan license.

Another feature of the book is very interesting as corroborating some of the testimony given in the preceding pages. On pages 399–406 there are ten cuts, which are copied from ancient frescoes representing (or rather caricaturing) baptismal scenes,

some of them evidently intended to represent the baptism of Christ. The author has inserted these pictures in order to counteract as much as possible the testimony which truth compelled him to give concerning baptism; for in none of them is the candidate represented as being immersed. In some of them, the candidate is represented as just coming out of the water, so that it is impossible to tell whether the rite that had evidently just been performed was immersion or pouring. In others, however, the administrator is represented as laying his hand on the candidate's head, or else pouring water upon it from a vessel. From these cuts the author finds authority enough to warrant the substitution of sprinkling or pouring for immersion. This is what might be termed *pictorial theology.*

But in these very pictures the inconsistency of those who appeal to custom instead of to the Bible is most clearly revealed. We quote the author's own description of the first caricature :—

"Christ stands in the Jordan, whose waters reach to about the middle of the body, while John, standing on the land, and holding in his left hand a jeweled cross, is pouring water from a shell held in the Baptist's right hand. The symbolic dove, descending directly upon the head of Jesus, completes the baptismal representation. The Jordan, IORD, *symbolized by a river-god bearing a reed, introduces into the scene a heathen element.*"—*P. 404.*

The italics are ours. It is passing strange, and a wonderful instance of the blindness which custom induces, that a Christian author can put forth as authority for the practice of Christians, a *picture* in which he acknowledges that there are heathen elements, and this too in the face of his previous acknowledgment that the scriptural and apostolic baptism is immersion.

This, however, is not all. In all of these ancient caricatures, (with two exceptions), the candidate who is being sprinkled or *poured* is perfectly nude. In the two exceptions he has on a single garment. Therefore, according to the testimony of these pictures, there is the same authority for sprinkling instead of immersing that there is for stripping the candidate of his clothes. As a matter of fact, which is attested by Bingham, in the passages which we have cited from him, people were baptized naked before sprinkling was substituted for baptism.

To sum up the case : Immersion is the only baptism known to

the Bible writers. Sprinkling, and the administration of the rite to infants, was not known in the church until the third century, and did not become common before the sixth century. It is therefore an institution of the Catholic Church. All the authority that Protestants can claim for it is the custom of that church. Some pictures, however, have been found, which represent the candidate for church-membership as being sprinkled; and in order to get sprinkling as near apostolic times as possible, some archæologists are quoted as *supposing* that these pictures were made in the second century, notwithstanding the statement of the author that sprinkling was not known so early in the church. But however this may be, the pictures represent the candidate as naked, and introduce a confessedly heathen element. So that whoever cites them as warrant for the practice of Christians stultifies himself. To such contemptible shifts does *custom* force its devotees to resort. How much better to acknowledge the Scripture truth that "the customs of the people are vain," and follow the Bible and that alone.

ERRATUM.—On page 62, eighth line from bottom of page, for *reputation* read *refutation*.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURES QUOTED.

Text.	Page.
GENESIS.	
6:2	17
8:21	42
2:1-3	350
1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31	355
EXODUS.	
20:8-11	347, 348, 349
19:12, 23	351
LEVITICUS.	
23:32	355
DEUTERONOMY.	
18:10	50
33:17	158
22:5	311
JOSHUA.	
20:7	351
1 KINGS.	
12:26-31	313
2 KINGS.	
4:23	200
10:29	313
21:1-7	313
23:4-14	313
PSALMS.	
14:1	10
19:1	10
119:105	56
116:10	234
111:7, 8	352
ECCLESIASTES.	
10:1	63
ISAIAH.	
8:20	52
JEREMIAH.	
17:9	42
10:3	251
EZEKIEL.	
14:14	153
8:16	195, 305
8:6	304
JOEL.	
1:14	351
MATTHEW.	
15:19, 20	42
7:21-23	54
13:47	54
18:17	54
23:10	55
28:19, 20	57
28:1	352
MARK.	
16:1	348
16:1, 2	352
16:9	353
16:12, 13, 14	354
1:32	355
LUKE.	
9:51-56	47
24:1	348, 353
23:54-56	348
16:17	352
24:36-43	354
JOHN.	
3:5	53
15:4, 5	53
20:1	353
20:19	353
ACTS.	
14:17	10
17:21	37
15:36-41	47
20:28-30	48
19:24	156
1:13	354
20:7	354
20:7, 8, 11	355
ROMANS.	
1:21	9
1:19	10
1:22-32	10, 28
1:18-32	11
1:29-31	13
1:22-24	36
8:7	42
8:9	53
16:14	84

TEXT.	PAGE.
1 CORINTHIANS.	
5:1, 2	26
1:11–13	49
5:1, 2	49
6:6–8	49
11:17–22	49
12:12, 13	53
12:13	255
16:2	356
2 CORINTHIANS.	
4:5	57
4:13	234
9:5	356
GALATIANS.	
5:19–21	42, 43
2:11–14	47
4:8–11	50
3:27	53
1:8	57
6:11	105
EPHESIANS.	
5:12	12
2:1–3	42
1:20–23	52
4:30	53
COLOSSIANS.	
2:8	44
1:18	52
2 THESSALONIANS.	
2:3–7	49
2:1–3	104
2:5	104
3:17, 18	105
2:3, 4, 7, 8	242
2:4	337
2 TIMOTHY.	
2:16–18	50
HEBREWS.	
10:29	53
2 PETER.	
1:1–3	48
1 JOHN.	
2:6	53
2 JOHN.	
7	50
3 JOHN.	
9, 10	51
JUDE.	
4, 10	51
16	52
6	239
REVELATION.	
17:5	124

INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED.

Anthon's Classical Dictionary, 309, 310, 311.
Bacon, 43.
Barnabas, 78, 80, 81–83.
Bibliotheca Sacra, 249.
Bingham, 192, 228, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 269, 273, 274, 279, 280, 297, 302, 303, 332.
Bower, 252.
Chamber's Encyclopedia, 301, 319.
Chambers, Talbot W., 305, 314, 318, 319.
Christian at Work, 294, 296.
Carson, 252.
Catholic Christian Instructed, 297.
Clement of Alexandria, 170, 171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180–182, 183.
Clarke, Adam, 59.
Constantine, 323.
Clement of Rome, 94.
Coxe, Bishop A. C., 72, 77, 92, 114, 142, 143, 146, 147, 173, 176, 182, 188, 189, 207, 322.
De Clemangis, 282.
De Quincey, 62.
Dunbar, 271.
Edersheim, 23, 24, 25.
Encyclopedia Britannica, 30, 72, 74, 99, 100, 302, 306, 309, 323.
Eusebius, 320, 326.
Evangelical Review, British and Foreign, 125.
Farrar, 60, 61, 80, 127, 149, 169, 186, 226.
Franklin, Benjamin, 262.
Gibbon, 18, 20, 45, 264, 315, 316, 317, 318, 335, 337, 340, 341, 342.
Gieseler, 289.
Harnack, 116–118, 218, 225.
Hermas, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90.
Holmes, G. F., 30, 31, 32.
Horne, 14.
Hogue, 219.
Herodotus, 16.
Irenæus, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143.
Ignatius, 97, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112.
Independent, New York, 114.

Justin Martyr, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163.
Kitto, 77, 97–99.
Killen, 68–71, 102, 105, 108, 125, 148, 169, 184, 187, 190, 191, 192, 217, 231, 243, 244, 255, 257, 265, 272, 274, 277, 280, 292, 331.
Lawrence, Eugene, 334.
Lea, H. C., 282.
Matthews, William, 22.
Maximus Tyrius, 16.
Milman, Dean, 216, 314, 316, 325, 331, 332, 335.
McClintock and Strong, 18, 19, 30, 31, 32, 34, 74, 99, 166, 256, 300, 339.
Mosheim, 16, 19, 21, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 74, 75, 84, 85, 93, 106, 127, 148, 166, 167, 186, 218, 219–223, 224, 225, 227, 245, 247, 250, 251, 253, 264, 270, 275, 283, 291, 292, 296, 297, 299, 339.
Müller, 302.
Neander, 15, 20, 73, 75, 94, 107, 148, 191, 267, 288.
North British Review, 318.
Origen, 231, 232, 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240.
Papias, 126.
Pettengill, J. H., 271.
Plato, 16, 36.
Pope, 39.
Proclus, 15.
Rawlinson, 307, 308.
Ridpath, 320–322.
Robinson, 278.
Robinson, Charles S., 294.
Rufinus, 230.
Schaff, 16, 18, 76, 107, 126, 148, 192, 226, 282, 288.
Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, 34, 75, 100, 165, 185, 312, 319, 339.
Scott, 295.
Schlegel, 300.
Socrates Scholasticus, 287, 333, 334, 344.
Stuart, Moses, 11, 12, 13.
Teaching of the Apostles, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124.
Tertullian, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202–204, 205, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214–216.
Tyler, W. S., 34.
Von Einem, 300.
Webster, Noah, 318.
Wayland, Dr., 59.
Western Churchman, 190.
Worman, 19, 229.

INDEX.

Agnostics, Modern, Followers of Plato..... 31
Ammonius Saccas, Fanatical philosophy of..... 220–225
Ammonius Saccas, Christian teachers, especially Origen, followers of.... .....224, 225
Ammonius Saccas, Philosophy of, wisdom run mad..... 225
Ammonius Saccas, Frauds necessary to philosophy of..... 225
Apostles, Their testimony rejected by some in the churches.. 51
Apostles, Teaching of the.....113–124
Apostles, Teaching of the, History of.... .. ..113, 114
Apostles, Teaching of the, Not apostolic..... 114
Apostles, Teaching of the, When written..... .....114, 116
Apostles, Teaching of the, Childishness of.....114, 122
Apostles, Teaching of the, Tainted by heresy and incompetency..... 114
Apostles, Teaching of the, Conflicting opinions concerning 116–118
Apostles, Teaching of the, Summary of opinions of....116–118
Apostles, Teaching of the, Lord's day, supposed mention of, 118
Apostles, Teaching of the, Extracts from.....118–124
Apostles, Teaching of the, Inconsistency of those who credit, 119
Apostles, Teaching of the, Actually no mentioning of Lord's day in..... 119
Apostles, Teaching of the, Fasting on Wednesday and Friday commanded by..... 121
Apostles, Teaching of the, Its perversion of baptism..... 122
Apostles, Teaching of the, Stealing recommended by..... . 123
Apostles, Teaching of the, Atonement for sin by money taught in 124
Apostasy, Paul's prediction of..... 242
Apostasy, Progress of in first century after apostles....243, 244
Aristotle, Taught the expediency of abortion..... 14
Asceticism, Growth of in the church..... 280

Asceticism, Vice a result of.....281, 282
Asceticism, Growth of 283
Asceticism, Platonic philosophy responsible for..... 283
Atonement, Supposed to be gained by martyrdom.....109, 110
Aurelian, Sun-worship in time of..... 315

Babylonians, Prostitution required by.....11, 12
Bacon, Rule of for guarding against error..... 43
Baptism, Perverted in Teaching of the Apostles..... 122
Baptism, Perversion of in Tertullian's time..... 200
Baptism, Tertullian on.....200, 210–213
Baptism, Perversion of.....256–263
Baptism of the dead..... 257
Baptism, Character of heathen mysteries given to it....257, 258
Baptism, Water of consecrated..... 258
Baptism, Sanctifying power attributed to waters of..... 258
Baptism, Sign of cross in connection with.....257–259
Baptism, Candidates undressed for.....260–263
Barnabas, Epistle of.....74–83
Barnabas, Epistle of, a forgery..... 74
Barnabas, Epistle of, uncertainty of authorship.....74, 75
Barnabas, Epistle of, statement concerning Sabbath..... 78
Barnabas, Epistle of, about unclean beasts..... 81
Bible, How shown to be true 40
Bible, The only standard of right and wrong..... 56
Bible, Precepts of, neglected by Justin Martyr.....152, 153
Bible, Justin Martyr's figurative interpretation of.....154, 155
Bishop of Rome, Exaltation of.....292, 331–336
Bishops of Rome, Extravagantly lauded by Ignatius....110, 111
Bishop of Rome, Rival of Emperor. 331, 3 2
Bishop of Rome, Opulence of..... 335
Bishop of Rome, Method of electing 336
Bishop, Power of..... 337
Bishop, Heathen elected to office of.....338–341
Blindness of heathen, Cause of..... 28
Blood atonement, Origin of Mormon doctrine of..... 109, 110

Calf-worship by Israelites,—Sun-worship..... .309, 312, 313
Carson, Existing religious customs, Statement concerning.. 252
Catholic Church, Clement of Alexandria highly esteemed by, 173

Catholic Church, Clement of Alexandria never swerved from, 173
Catholic Church, a growth of error.....329, 330
Catholic Church, Fathers, the head of..... 330
Ceremonies, Great increase of..... 299
Charms and Divination, Use of in church..... 269
Christians taken from depraved heathenism..... 26
Christian converts, Dangers to which they were exposed.... 50
Christian Ordinances, Perversion of in 2nd century.....253–255
Christian Religion, Impaired by philosophy..... 68
Christ, The only true pattern..... 55
Church, The True, Christ the head of.....52, 53
Church, Who constitute the true.....53, 54
Church, Influence of Fathers upon..... 66
Church, Early, Shepherd of Hermas inspired book..... 86
Church, Early, immorality in.....276–281
Christmas, Not of divine appointment..... 300
Christmas, How introduced into the church.....301–303
Christmas, Heathen origin of.....301, 302
Christmas, How observed..... 302
Christmas, Chief of festivals..... 303
Christmas, Sunday of less importance than..... 303
Clarke, Adam, Testimony concerning the Fathers..... 59
Clement, A poor expositor of Scripture..... 60
Clement of Alexandria.....165–183
Clement of Alexandria, Statements concerning..165–169, 172–174
Clement of Alexandria, Paganism and Christianity confounded by.....165, 168
Clement of Alexandria, Fanciful interpreter.....166–169
Clement of Alexandria, Speculative philosopher.....166, 167
Clement of Alexandria, Scriptures, wretched perverter of 167, 168
Clement of Alexandria, Philosophy, chief defender of..... 167
Clement of Alexandria, Taught identity of Christianity and Greek philosophy..... 168
Clement of Alexandria, Absurdly allegorized Scripture..... 169
Clement of Alexandria, Ten commandments allegorized by.. 169
Clement of Alexandria, Ignorant of Scripture..... 169
Clement of Alexandria, Plato, called a prophet by..... 169

Clement of Alexandria, Extracts from 170–183
Clement of Alexandria, Starving of children, an advocate of, 170
Clement of Alexandria, Senseless interpretation, specimens of..... 171, 172, 174, 175
Clement of Alexandria, Peter's tribute money, absurd exposition of..... 171
Clement of Alexandria, Claimed philosophy to be preparation for faith in Christ..... 172
Clement of Alexandria, Quoted Scripture inaccurately..... 172
Clement of Alexandria, Great repute of in Catholic Church 173, 179
Clement of Alexandria, False science in writings of..... 173
Clement of Alexandria, Frivolous and fanciful speculation in writings of..... 173
Clement of Alexandria, Tabernacle mystically explained by 174, 175
Clement of Alexandria, Lord's day, statement concerning 176, 178
Clement of Alexandria, Sabbath, statement concerning.... 177
Clement of Alexandria, Words without sense, use of..... 177
Clement of Alexandria, Probation after death, teacher of 178, 179
Clement of Alexandria, Fanciful speculation, specimen of.180–182
Clement of Alexandria, Christian literature, Founder of.... 182
Clement of Alexandria, Scripture meaning declared hidden by..... 183
Clement of Rome, Epistle of.....93–96
Clement of Rome on Resurrection, Foolish argument for..94, 95
Community of Women, Plato's teaching concerning..... 36
Confessors, Definition of..... 291
Confessors, Veneration paid to..... 291
Corinth, Errors in church of..... 49
Constantine, Sun-worship of.....317, 318, 325
Constantine, Sunday edict of.....318, 319, 323, 326
Constantine's Edict, First Law for Sunday..... 319
Constantine, Desired to be worshiped.....320, 325
Constantine, Religious convictions, lack of..... 320
Constantine, Double-dealing nature of.....321, 322

Constantine, Heathenism of.....322, 323, 325
Constantine's Sunday edict, Pagan nature of.....318, 323
Constantine, Prayer composed by, for his soldiers..... 327
Constantine, Edict of concerning Arius..... 344
Controversy, Fathers used falsehoods in..... 65
Council of Laodicea, Canon of concerning Sunday..... 298
Council of Laodicea, Canon of concerning promiscuous bathing..... 299
Coxe Bishop, Opinion of apostolic Fathers..... 72
Dead, Prayers to in second century..... 273
Deception, Practiced by Fathers.....65, 66
Diocletian, Sun-worship in time of..... 316
Elagabalus, Design of, to make the sun the central object of adoration..... 315
Episcopal Chair, Methods of obtaining..... 336
Epistles Forged in Paul's day..... 104
Epistle of Barnabas.....74–83
Epistle of Barnabas, A forgery.....74–77
Epistle of Barnabas, Authorship uncertain.....74–77
Epistle of Barnabas, The apostle not author of.....75–78
Epistle of Barnabas, All sorts of absurd fancies found in.... 76
Epistle of Barnabas, Author of possessed little genius..... 75
Epistle of Barnabas, Silly interpretations in.....75, 80–82
Epistle of Barnabas, Interpretation puerile and absurd..... 77
Epistle of Barnabas, Extracts from.....73–83
Epistle of Barnabas, Testimony concerning Sabbath.....78, 79
Epistle of Barnabas, Egotism of author of... 80
Epistle of Barnabas, Fanciful and absurd intrepretation of Scripture 81, 82
Epistle of Barnabas, Absurd fancy concerning the hyena... 82
Epistle of Clement..... ..93–96
Epistles of Ignatius.....97–112
Epistles of Ignatius, Cause perplexities to critics..... 100
Epistles of Ignatius, number..... 100
Epistles of Ignatius, Eight universally admitted to be forgeries 101
Epistles of Ignatius, Authenticity and genuineness doubtful... .....101, 106

Epistles of Ignatius, All frauds..... 103
Epistles of Ignatius, Condemned by Calvin..... 108
Epistles of Ignatius, More trustworthy edition very much interpolated..... 107
Epistles of Ignatius, Mutilated by "pious" frauds..... 107
Epistles of Ignatius, Abominable trash..... 108
Epistles of Ignatius, Extracts from 108–112
Error, Natural to human heart..... 42
Error, Bacon's rule for guarding against..... 43
Error in church at Corinth..... 49
Errors of fact and doctrine in Fathers..... 60
Exorcism, Baptism preceded by.....257, 258

Facts, Historical, denied by Justin Martyr..... 149
Falsehoods, Writings of Fathers contain.....64, 65, 85
Fasting on Wednesday and Friday commanded by teaching of the apostles..... 121
Fathers, Who so called..... 58
Fathers, Claim made for them..... 58
Fathers, How their teachings should be judged..... 58
Fathers, The abettors of every heresy in church..... 59
Fathers, Most foolish opinions sustained by..... 59
Fathers, To whom they are valuable..... 60
Fathers, Loss of their writings not to be deplored..... 60
Fathers, Direct meaning of Scriptures neglected by..... 60
Fathers, To obscure true meaning of Scripture their chief study..... 60
Fathers, Writings rife with errors..... 60
Fathers, Writings of, unreliable as to matters of fact and of doctrine..... 60
Fathers, Add nothing to our understanding of Scripture... 61
Fathers, Ignorant of Scripture..... 61
Fathers, Their intrepretation warped by Paganism..... 61
Fathers, Antichristian practices of..... 62
Fathers, Refuted error and superstition by error and superstition..... 62
Fathers, Advanced doctrines unwarranted by Scripture.... 63
Fathers, Determined to be wiser than God..... 63
Fathers, Flimsy arguments of..... 63

Fathers, Bad masters in morals..... 64
Fathers, Had no clear conception of virtue and vice 64
Fathers, Things positively false in writings of..... 64
Fathers, Opinions of all sects sustained by..... 64
Fathers, Falsehoods used in controversies of..... 65
Fathers, Taught that deception was commendable..... 66
Fathers, Desired victory rather than truth..... 65
Fathers, Exalted heathen philosophy..... 67
Fathers, Study of philosophy recommended by..... 67
Fathers, Their expositions of Scripture childish..... . 70
Fathers, Vagaries of.. 70
Fathers, Apostolic, Who so called..... 72
Fathers, Apostolic, Unlike New Testament writers.....72, 73
Fathers, Apostolic, Uncertainty of writings..... 73
Fathers, The Pope the mouthpiece of..... 330
Festivals, Pagan, Christian festivals modeled after..... 247
Festivals, Pagan, Character of..... 248
Festivals, Heathen, why adopted by the church..... 303
Figurative Interpretation of Bible by Justin Martyr....154, 155
Forgeries, Practiced by the most orthodox..... 66
Forgery, Epistle of Barnabas a..... ...74–77
Forgery of Paul's name in epistle to Thessalonians..... 104
Frauds, "Pious" used by Fathers.....65, 85
Frauds, "Pious" use of by Christian teachers.....274, 275
Friday, Observed as holiday by early churches..... 297

Gods of Heathen, Patterns of vice, 18, 19; Disrespect to them was treason..... .....20, 21
Good Friday, Observed by early church..... ..297, 300
Gospels, Four, Puerile reason for by Irenæus.....133, 134
Greek Philosophy, Church controlled by..... 271
Gregory Thaumaturgus, Church corrupted by..... 247

Heathen, Described by Paul.....9–13
Heathen Mysteries..... .. ..12, 13
Heathen, Taught their children vice..... 13
Heathen Philosophers, Immorality of.....14–16
Heathen of all classes consumed in practice of abominable and unnamable vice..... 16
Heathen, Licentiousness of, 11–19, 25; No real conception of sin or holiness..... 22

Heathenism, A school of vice, 11; State religion..... 20
Heathenism, Prostitution a part of its worship..... 12
Heathen Customs, introduced into church.... ..247, 250, 251
Heathen Philosophy, adopted in order to attract heathen 270, 271
Heathen Festivals, Why adopted by church..... 303
Heathen Marriage, Corruption of..... .....17, 23, 25
Heathen, Deified emperors and vile persons..... 24
Heathen, Cause of their blindness..... 28
Hercules, Ancient sun-god..... 309–311
Hermas, What is known of..... .....84, 85
Hermas, Shepherd of..... 84–92
Hermas, Shepherd of, Foolish and insipid..... . 84
Hermas, Wild disordered fanatic..... 85
Hermas, Shepherd of, immorality inculcated by.....86, 91
Holidays of the church..... ....296, 297
Holidays, How celebrated at first.... 247
Holiness an unmeaning term to heathen 22
Idolatry a religion of obscenity..... 13
Ignatian Epistles, All frauds..... 103
Ignatian Epistles, More trustworthy edition very much interpolated... 107
Ignatian Epistles, Mutilated by pious fraud..... 107
Ignatian Epistles, All condemned by Calvin.... 108
Ignatian Epistles, Abominable trash..... 108
Ignatian Epistles, Extracts from.....108–112
Ignatius, Epistles of 97–112
Ignatius, Supposed testimony concerning Sabbath.. 97
Ignatius, Information concerning, very meager..... . 99
Ignatius, Letters of cause great perplexity to critics 100
Ignatius, Epistles of, How many 100
Ignatius, Crazy fanatic, puerile boaster..... 103
Ignatius, Epistles of, Eight universally regarded as spurious..... 101
Ignatius, Epistles of, Authenticity and genuineness doubtful..... .. .. 101, 106
Ignatius, Desire of for martyrdom.....108–110
Ignatius, Extravagant praise of bishop.... .....110, 111

Ignatius, Absurd idea of concerning Virgin Mary..... 111
Ignatius, senseless egotism, specimen of..... 112
Images, use of, among Christians..... 267
Imagination, The commanding feature of Plato's intellect.. 32
Immorality of heathen philosophers..... 14
Immorality in early church.....49, 50, 51, 276–281
Incense, Use of in church..... 300
Irenæus.....125–145
Irenæus, Testimonies concerning.....125–130
Irenæus, Ignorance of.....142, 143
Irenæus, Absurd interpretation of Scripture by.....143, 144
Irenæus, Influence of blighting to Christianity..... 145
Irenæus, Uncertainty of information concerning 125
Irenæus, Writings of, of very little value..... 125
Irenæus, Puerilities in writings of..... 126
Irenæus, Pupil of Papias..... 126
Irenæus, Folly of Papias, preceptor of. 126, 127
Irenæus, Most unsafe authority..... 127
Irenæus, Writings of, wretchedly translated..... 128
Irenæus, Writings of, very involved and prolix..... 128
Irenæus, Conjectural translation of writings of.....128, 129
Irenæus, Exaltation of ecclesiastics by..... 130
Irenæus, Upbuilding of Roman hierarchy..... .130, 131
Irenæus, Obedience to Church of Rome taught by.....131–133
Irenæus, Puerile reasoning about four gospels.....133, 134
Irenæus, Fit companion for Barnabas..... 134
Irenæus, Ridiculous interpretation of commands concerning clean and unclean beasts.....134, 135
Irenæus, Testimony of, concerning Sunday..... 136
Irenæus, The Sabbath, uncertain reference to..... 137
Irenæus, Perpetuity of the law taught by.....137, 138
Irenæus, Purgatory, doctrine of taught by..... 138
Irenæus, Scripture authority not enhanced by..... 138
Irenæus, Resurrection and immortality, testimony on..... 139
Irenæus, Speculation concerning age of Jesus.....139–141
Irenæus, Writings of almost unintelligible..... 142
Irenæus, Senseless theory of, concerning name of Jesus.... 142
Justin Martyr.....146–164

Justin Martyr, Testimony concerning.....60, 63, 146–149
Justin Martyr, Extracts from.....149–163
Justin Martyr, Personal history of..... 146
Justin Martyr, Philosopher's gown worn after professed conversion..... 147
Justin Martyr, Always a pagan.....147, 148, 149
Justin Martyr, Equivocal and contradictory allusions to Christian doctrine..... 148
Justin Martyr, Confused views of gospel doctrines..... 148
Justin Martyr, Sought to harmonize Christianity with Platonic philosophy..... 148
Justin Martyr, Ignorance of..... 148
Justin Martyr, Wanting in discernment..... 148
Justin Martyr, Loose, fanciful, and puerile reasoning of..148, 149
Justin Martyr, First to bring Platonic philosophy and Christianity in contact..... 149
Justin Martyr, Historical facts denied by..... 149
Justin Martyr, Testimony concerning Sunday.....149, 150
Justin Martyr, Perversion of Lord's Supper..... 151
Justin Martyr, Not a believer in Sunday sacredness..... 151
Justin Martyr, A no-Sabbath man.....151–153
Justin Martyr, Scripture precepts denied by.....152, 153
Justin Martyr, Sabbath observance, his idea of.....152, 153
Justin Martyr, Abolition of law, taught by..... 153
Justin Martyr, Incorrect quoter of the Scripture.....153, 154
Justin Martyr, Interpretation of Bible, mode of. 154, 155
Justin Martyr, Direct Scripture statements denied by.... 154
Justin Martyr, Sunday argument, a sample of..... 155
Justin Martyr, Ark, eight persons in the, a type of "eight days".....155, 156
Justin Martyr, Sign of cross, all power ascribed to by...156–161
Justin Martyr, Statement that Amalek was conquered, not through prayer of Moses, but by sign of cross.....156, 157
Justin Martyr, Prophecy concerning Joseph, exposition of 157, 158
Justin Martyr, Scripture, narrow view of.....158–161, 163
Justin Martyr, Sign of cross, claimed that all heathen reverenced..... 160

Justin Martyr, Heathen, his puerile methods of arguing with 160, 161
Justin Martyr, Necromancy, a believer in..... 161, 162
Justin Martyr, Contradictory positions taken by..... 161–163
Justin Martyr, Soul and body, necessity of each other, shown by..... 162
Justin Martin, Far-fetched and absurd figures of Christ..... 163
Justin Martyr, Jacob's marriage a type of Christ, claimed by..... 163
Justin Martyr, Evidently not Bible student..... 164
Killen on Ignatian epistles..... 102, 105, 108
Language of Heathen incapable of expressing moral ideas.. 22
Laodicea, Council of, canon concerning Sunday..... 298
Laodicea, Council of, canon on promiscuous bathing..... 299
Law of God, Abolition of, taught by Justin Martyr..... 153
Law, Perpetuity of, taught by Irenæus..... 137, 138
Lord's Day, The, in epistles of Ignatius..... 97–99
Lord's Day, The, really no mention of by Ignatius..... 97–99
Lord's Day, Supposed mention of in Teaching of Apostles 118
Lord's Day, Actually not found in Teaching of Apostles .. 119
Lord's Day, Clement of Alexandria's statement concerning..... 176, 178
Lord's Day, Origen's mention of..... 232
Lord's Supper, Perversion of in time of Justin Martyr..... 151
Lord's Supper, Justin Martyr's statement concerning celebration of..... 151
Lycurgus, Allowed the exposure of children..... 14
Marriage, Looseness of relation among heathen..... 17, 23, 25
Martyrdom, Desire for by Ignatius..... 108–110
Martyrdom, Fanatical idea concerning..... 109, 110
Martyrdom, Substituted for baptism..... 288
Martyrdom, Atonement for sins obtained by..... 288, 289
Martyrs, Pilgrimages to tombs of..... 283, 284
Martyrs, Worship of..... 284
Martyrs, Prayers addressed to..... 291
Martyrs, Elevated to place of heathen demi-gods..... 286–292
Martyrs, Exaggerated honor paid to..... 288

Midwifery of the mind..... 34
Miracles, False, produced by relics... 290
Monkery, Turtullian an abettor of..... 192
Monkery, A promoter of vice..... 281
Montanus, Sketch of. 187
Montanism, Description of..... 187
Montanus, Tertullian a follower of..... 191

Natural Inclination, Depravity of..... 42, 43
Necromancy, Justin Martyr a believer in..... 161, 162
Neo-Platonism, Origen a devotee of..... 218, 223
Neo-Platonism, Account of..... 219–223
Neo-Platonism, Religion obscured by..... 223
Neo-Platonism, Spiritualism identical with..... 223
Neo-Platonism, Superstition nourished by... 224
Neo-Platonism, Monkery fostered by..... 224

Obstetrical Procedure, Plato's theory of..... 35
Origen..... 217–241
Origen, Statements concerning..... 217–231
Origen, Birth of..... 217
Origen, Writings of, mutilated and garbled..... 217
Origen, Neo-Platonism, devotee of... 218
Origen, Heathen science and Christian faith reconciled by.. 218
Origen, A wild allegorizer..... 219
Origen, Clearest teachings muddled by..... 219
Origen, Spiritualism introduced into the church by..... 223
Origen, Church filled with false philosophy by..... 225
Origen, Quotations from..... 231–241
Origen, Literal Scripture narrative disparaged by..... 226
Origen, The law allegorized by..... 226
Origen, Doctrine of works of supererogation taught by.... 227
Origen, Chief of Christian interpreters of third century.... 227
Origen, Found in Scripture retreat for all errors and idle fancies... 227
Origen, Biblical history, turned into fables by..... 227
Origen, Contradictory nature of works of..... 230, 231
Origen, Untrustworthy interpreter..... 231
Origen, Christian mysticism, father of..... 231
Origin, Pre-existence of souls taught by... 231

Origen, Sabbath, statement concerning.. 232
Origen, Sabbath, allegorized by..... 232
Origen, Lord's day, mentioned by..... 232
Origen, Reasonableness of Scripture denied by..... 233
Origen, Scripture declared to contain falsehood by.....234, 235
Origen, Infidelity of worst type upheld by.....233–236
Origen, Scripture allegorizing specimen of..... 236
Origen, False science, specimen of.....237, 238
Origen, Conversion of the devil foretold by..... 237
Origen, Purgatory, doctrine of taught by.....239, 240
Origen, Father of Universalism.....239, 240
Origen, Punishment of wicked spiritualized by.....240, 241
Pagan Temples mere brothels.. .....11, 21
Pagan Festivals, Scenes of licentiousness..... 21
Pagan Prayers..... 21
Pagan Ideas in church, how brought in..... .....165, 166
Pagan Literati, Influence of in church..... 280
Pagan Festivals, Character of..... 248
Pagan Mysteries, How brought into the church.....245, 246
Papal Assumption, Growth of.....329–344
Papal Hierarchy, Established before time of Constantine... 335
Papias, Preceptor of Irenæus..... 126
Papias, Monstrous and fabulous inventions of.....126, 127
Papias, Egregious liar..... 127
Persecution of Jews and Christians, reason of.....20, 21
Persecution, Religious, sanctioned by Constantine.....343, 344
Perversion of Christian ordinances.....253–255
Philosophy, Pagan, Clement of Alexandria addicted to..166, 167
Philosophizing, Passion for by Christian teachers..... 166
Philosophy, Chiefly defended by Clement of Alexandria.... 167
Philosophy, Greek, identified with Christianity by Clement of Alexandria..... 168
Philosophers Countenanced vicious practices, 11, 13, 14–18; lived most vicious lives, 15; considered all religions equally false or equally true..... 24
Philosophy of Heathen, Led to atheism and despair..... 24
Philosophy of Plato, Negative..... 30
Philosophy, Greek, church controlled by..... 271

Philosophy of Plato, Church corrupted by..... 271
Philosophy, Claimed by Clement of Alexandria to be preparation for faith in Christ..... 172
Philosophy, Necessary to Christianity, claimed by Clement of Alexandria..... 172
Philosophy, Heathen, adopted by church to attract the heathen..... 269, 270
Philosophy, Church filled with by Origen..... 225
Philosophy, Platonic, interwoven with Christianity by Justin Martyr..... 148, 149
Philosopher's Gown, Worn by Justin Martyr..... 147, 148
Philosopher's Gown, Signification of..... 147
Philosopher's Gown, Survival of in Christian pulpits..... 147
Philosophers, Why they missed the truth..... 41
Philosophers, Heathen, exalted by Fathers..... 67
Philosophers, Christianity impaired by..... 68
"Pious" Frauds, Adoption of by church teachers..... 274, 275
Platonic Philosophy, Asceticism fostered by..... 281
Plato, Called evangelical prophet by Clement of Alexandria..... 169
Platonic Philosophy, Acceptance of resulted in doctrine of purgatory..... 272
Plato, Quoted as prophet by Clement of Alexandria..... 176
Plato, Advocated child murder, 14, 37; commended swearing, 15; advocated lying, 16; the father of philosophy, 29; birth and education of, 29; worshiped after death as a god, 30; his treatises all negative, 30; had no fixed principles, 31; imagination the chief faculty of intellect, 31; taught the pre-existence of souls, 33, 34; his "Republic," immorality in, 35, 36; taught community of women, 36; advocated promiscuous intercourse of sexes, 37; why he missed the truth..... 41
Plato, Philosophy of, adopted by Christian teachers..... 148
Plato, His philosophy adhered to by Justin Martyr..... 148
Pope, The mouthpiece of the Fathers..... 330
Priests of Heathenism openly taught licentiousness, 19; taught that the gods allowed sensual gratification..... 20
Prayers, of Heathen..... 21

Prostitution, Commanded by law..... 12
Probation after Death, Clement of Alexandria advocate of 178, 179
Pre-existence of Souls, Taught by Plato..... .....33, 34
Purgatory, Doctrine of, taught in Shepherd of Hermas..... 88
Purgatory, Doctrine of, taught by Irenæus..... 138
Purgatory, Tertullian taught doctrine of. 214, 215
Purgatory, Origen taught doctrine of.....239, 240
Purgatory and Prayers for Dead, Popularity of in church in second century.....272–274
Religious Rites, Nearly all of human invention..... 252
Relics, Traffic in.... 284
Religion, Displaced by superstition.....284, 285
Relic and Martyr Worship.....286–291
Relics, Worship of.....290
Relics, Miracles worked by.... 290
Resurrection, Phœnix, adduced by Clement of Rome as proof of..... .....94, 95
Rome, Moral condition of in time of Christ.....23, 24
Rome, Supremacy of bishop of.....331–336
Rome, Obedience to church of, taught by Irenæus.....131–133
Rome, Withholding Scripture from people, authority for.... 183
Sabbath, Supposed testimony of Ignatius on..... 97
Sabbath, Origen's views of..... 232
Sabbath, Literal nature of disbelieved by Origen..... 232
Sabbath, Existence of any denied by Justin Martyr.....151–153
Sabbath Observance, Justin Martyr's ideas of.....152, 153
Sabbath, Uncertain reference to by Irenæus..... 137
Sabbath, Tertullian's testimony on.....197–199
Sabbath, Clement of Alexandria's statement concerning.... 177
Sabbath, Change of gradually brought about.....295, 296
Sabbath, Observed by early Christians 296, 297
Saints, Catholic, character of.....287, 288
Saints, Catholic, filthiness of.....287, 288
Science, Definition of true... 37
Science, What is it? 38; Science, foundation of..... 39
Scripture, True meaning of obscured by Fathers..... 60
Scripture, Double meaning of taught by Fathers..... 60

Scripture, Knowledge of not increased by Fathers. 62
Scriptures, Childish expositions of Fathers..... 70
Scripture, Tertullian a slighter of..... 201
Scripture, Tertullian's fanciful interpretation of.....205, 206
Scripture, Origen denied reasonableness of..... 233
Scripture, Said by Origen to contain falsehoods.....234, 235
Scripture, Misquotation of by Justin Martyr.....153, 154
Scripture Statements, Justin Martyr's denial of..... 154
Scripture, Narrow view of by Justin Martyr.....158–160
Scriptures, Perverted by philosophizing teachers..... 167
Scripture, Inaccurately quoted by Clement ef Alexandria... 172
Scripture, Meaning of declared to be hidden, by Clement... 183
Scripture, Tertullian a perverter of.....185, 186
Shepherd of Hermas..... 84–92
Shepherd of Hermas, Author of forged dialogues..... 84
Shepherd of Hermas, Full of folly, superstition, and nonsense..... 84
Shepherd of Hermas, Author a willful cheat..... 85
Shepherd of Hermas, Author a wild, disordered fanatic.... 85
Shepherd of Hermas, A fictitious work..... 85
Shepherd of Hermas, Tone of Christianity in first centuries reflected by..... 86
Shepherd of Hermas, Opinion of early church concerning.. 86
Shepherd of Hermas, Quoted as Scripture by Fathers..... 88
Shepherd of Hermas, Extracts from. 86–91
Shepherd of Hermas, Immorality inculcated by.....86, 90, 91
Shepherd of Hermas, Taught doctrine of purgatory..... 88
Shepherd of Hermas, Doctrine of works of supererogation found in..... 89
Shepherd of Hermas, Study of tended to foster licentiousness..... 90–92
Shepherd of Hermas, One result of his teaching..... 281
Sign of the Cross, All power ascribed to by Justin Martyr 156–161
Sign of the Cross, Justin Martyr's claim that the Israelites conquered by it.....157, 158
Sign of the Cross, Tertullian on.....200, 202–206
Sign of the Cross, Baptism preceded by..... ...257–259

Sign of the Cross, Frequency of its use..... 264
Sign of the Cross, Considered as charm..... .....264, 265
Sign of the Cross, Pagan origin of.....265, 266
Slavery among the heathen..... .....15, 23
Socrates, Commended profanity, 15; practiced unnatural crimes..... .....15, 19
Sodomy practiced even by the philosophers.....11–15
Spiritualism, Brought into church by Origen..... 223
Spiritualism, Early adoption of by the church..... 273
Sunday, Testimony of Justin Martyr concerning.....149, 150
Sunday, Testimony concerning by Irenæus..... 136
Sunday, Refraining from kneeling on..... 136
Sunday, Tertullian's statements concerning.....195, 196
Sunday, Mosheim's statement concerning.....292, 293
Sunday, *Christian at Work* on..... .....294, 295
Sunday, *S. S. Times* on..... 295
Sunday, Wild holiday of Pagan times..... 318
Sunday Law, Constantine's, pagan nature of..... 318
Sunday as a Holiday, Origin of..... 196
Sunday, Not of apostolic origin..... 294
Sunday, Gradually and silently introduced..... 295
Sunday, Dr. Scott's testimony concerning..... 295
Sunday, Decree of council of Laodicea concerning..... 298
Sunday, Devoted to sun by pagans.....318, 319
Sunday, Christmas more highly esteemed than..... 303
Sunday, First law in favor of..... 319
Sunday, Constantine's relation to.....318–327
Sun-worship, Tertullian authority for 195, 196
Sun-worship and Sunday..... 304–328
Sun-worship, Scripture mention of.....305, 313
Sun-worsnip, How regarded by the Lord..... 305
Sun-worship, Universality of..... 305–312
Sun-worship, Abominations of.....306, 307, 309, 311, 312
Sun-worship, Religion of licentiousness.....307, 309, 311
Sun-worship among Romans..... .....312, 314–319
Sun-worship in time of Elagabalus..... ...314, 315
Sun-worship in time of Aurelian..... 315
Sun-worship in time of Diocletian..... 316

Sun-worship by Constantine.....317, 318, 325
Sun, Confounded by Christians with Son of Righteousness 317, 319
Sun-god, Various representations of.....306–312
Superstition, Religion displaced by.....284, 285
Supererogatory Merit, Doctrine of taught in Shepherd of Hermas..... 89
Supererogation, Doctrine of works of, taught by Origen.... 227
"Teaching of the Apostles".....113–124
Teaching of the Apostles, History of.....113, 114
Teaching of the Apostles, Not apostolic..... 114
Teaching of the Apostles, When written.....114, 116
Teaching of the Apostles, Childishness of.....114, 122
Teaching of the Apostles, Tainted by heresy and incompetency..... 114
Teaching of the Apostles, Summary of opinions on.....116–118
Teaching of the Apostles, Conflicting opinions concerning 116–118
Teaching of the Apostles, Lord's day, supposed mention of, 118
Teaching of the Apostles, Extracts from.....118–124
Teaching of the Apostles, Inconsistency of those who credit 119
Teaching of the Apostles, Actually no mention of Lord's day in..... 119
Teaching of the Apostles, Fasting on Friday and Wednesday commanded by..... 121
Teaching of the Apostles, On baptism..... 122
Teaching of the Apostles, Stealing recommended by..... 123
Teaching of the Apostles, Atonement of sins by money taught in..... 124
Tertullian, Gloomy fanatic..... 69
Tertullian, Voluminous writer.....184
Tertullian, Personal characteristics of.....184, 186
Tertullian, Passionate nature of..... 184
Tertullian, Exaggeration dealt in by.....184, 191
Tertullian, Untrustworthy as to matters of fact..... 184
Tertullian, Superstitious and bigoted..... 185
Tertullian, Scripture perverted by.....185, 186

Tertullian, Birth and conversion of..... 185
Tertullian, Catholic theology founded by... 185
Tertullian, Absurdity preferred to reason, by..... 186
Tertullian, Illogical..... 190
Tertullian, Untrustworthiness of... 190
Tertullian, Salvation by faith not understood by..... 190
Tertullian, Ungoverned imagination of..... 191
Tertullian, Monkery, a father of..... 192
Tertullian, Moral laxity favored by 192
Tertullian, Prayers to dead, taught by..... 192
Tertullian, Critical sagacity lacked by..... 193
Tertullian, Fiery nature of..... ... 193
Tertullian, Sunday, statements concerning.....195, 196
Tertullian, Sun-worshiper.....195, 196
Tertullian, Sabbath-keeping, statements concerning... .197–199
Tertullian, Sabbath, disbeliever in a..... 197
Tertullian, Sabbath law not abolished, testimony to..... 198
Tertullian, Scripture perverted by.....198, 199
Tertullian, Trine immersion taught by..... 200
Tertullian, Statements concerning.....69, 148, 184–192
Tertullian Quotations from..... 192–215
Tertullian, A Montanist.....186, 191
Tertullian, Insanity of... 189
Tertullian, An infatuated author..... 189
Tertullian, Catholicity of..... 189
Tertullian, Baptism, statement concerning perversion of.... 200
Tertullian, Offerings for the dead, practiced by..... ... 200
Tertullian, Sign of the cross, used by..... .....200, 202–206
Tertullian, Scripture ignored by..... 201
Tertullian, Heathenism and Christianity, identified by..204, 205
Tertullian, Scripture, fanciful interpretation of....205, 206, 208
Tertullian, Material Cross, his devotion to.....204–206, 213
Tertullian, Speculative writer..... 207
Tertullian, Soul, belief concerning.....207, 208, 209
Tertullian, Childish nonsense of.... .....208, 209
Tertullian, Science, ignorance of..... 209
Tertullian, Holy water, believer in..... ...211–213
Tertullian, Baptism, fanciful ideas of.....211–213

Tertullian, Ignorance of..... 148
Tertullian, On prayer..... 214
Tertullian, Doctrine of Purgatory taught by.....214, 215
Tertullian, Unchristian fanaticism of..... 216
Theodosius, Superstition of..... 287
Tradition, False concerning age of Jesus.....139–141
Tradition, Unsatisfactory nature of.....141, 142
Tradition, Bower's statement of the value of..... 252
Trine Immersion, Taught by Tertullian..... 200
Truth of the Bible, How demonstrated..... 40
Universalism taught by Origen.....239, 240
Victory, Rather than truth, the object of Fathers..... 65
Vagaries, Indulged in by Fathers..... 70
Women, Immorality of, among heathen..... 17
Women, Community of taught by Plato..... 36
Wickedness of heathen world chargeable to the philosophers 42
Works of Supererogation, Taught in Shepherd of Hermas.. 89

UNIVERSITY

YB 12883